



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF MARCH 5, 2025**

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

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner I; Lillian Zollinger, Planner III; Mark Harrington, City Attorney, Meredith Covey, Planner I; Elissa Martin, Planning Project Manager

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the Historic Preservation Board Meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL

A roll call was conducted with the present Board Members.

3. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from February 5, 2025.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from February 5, 2025. Board Member Gackle seconded the motion.

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

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, shared updates with the Historic Preservation Board. She thanked those who attended the General Plan open house last night. The project website has been updated to indicate where the General Plan process is currently. There is also information about the existing trends and a summary of the statistically valid survey. There is a questionnaire available on the project website as well where community members can weigh in on different land use and transportation scenarios that

best reflect the community vision. The questionnaire will be open through March 24, 2025. The General Plan information and questionnaire are at engageparkcity.org.

Director Ward reported that there are no items scheduled for the April 2, 2025, Historic Preservation Board Meeting. As a result, that meeting has been canceled. The next Historic Preservation Board Meeting will be held on May 7, 2025.

Board Member Alan Long stated that he is participating in the meeting virtually.

Planner I, Jacob Klopfenstein, shared additional updates with the Board. He thanked Board Members for their input last month on the Historic Preservation Award. Staff is currently running a request for proposal ("RFP") for the art piece. The RFP will remain open until March 14, 2025. He clarified that proposals are being accepted from artists interested in creating an art piece to commemorate the award for 517 Park Avenue. Board Member Lola Beatlebrox asked if the March 15, 2025, deadline allows enough time for applications to be received. Planner Klopfenstein explained that Staff will be monitoring that. If it looks like the deadline needs to be extended, that can be discussed.

There were no Board Member disclosures.

5. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

6. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 615 Woodside Avenue – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes to Modify Two Historic Window Openings on a Significant Historic Structure in the Historic Residential - 1 Zoning District. PL-25-06428.

Planner III, Lillian Zollinger, presented the Staff Report and explained that the item is for Material Deconstruction modification at 615 Woodside Avenue. This proposal was previously seen late last year. There is one modification to be reviewed at the meeting.

615 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure with a non-historic addition at the rear. The rear addition is an existing non-complying structure. This property is in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. It was noted that the Historic Preservation Board previously approved the lifting of the historic structure to construct a basement.

Planner Zollinger shared an image of the property. She explained that the image shows two windows, one highlighted in purple and one highlighted in orange. Those two windows do not currently meet egress requirements. The applicant has reconfigured some of the interior layout to create another bedroom on the inside of the structure. The highlighted windows need to be upgraded to meet safety egress requirements. It was

noted that the new windows will match the existing third window on the right in terms of dimensions and egress requirements. The Land Management Code ("LMC") states that the applicant should avoid interior changes and avoid modifying historic openings, but the LMC also notes that there is flexibility regarding windows on a secondary façade. Since these are on the secondary façade, Planning Staff recommends approval of the request.

Several proposed Conditions of Approval were reviewed, including the following:

- 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 windows approved to be expanded shall not exceed the minimum requirements for egress as outlined in the International Building Code;
- The Applicant shall update the Historic Preservation Plan to reflect the modification approved. New windows installed on the Historic Structure shall be made of wood.

It was noted that the applicant representative, Cole Knight, is present at the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Mr. Knight shared information about the smaller window that was shown. Previously, it was located in a bathroom, but it would now be located in a bedroom. There is some photographic documentation that shows the space beneath that window has had a lot of the siding patched. As a result, it appears the window is not a historic opening. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the area being discussed is located on the side of the home, which was confirmed. She wanted to know if it can be seen from the street. Mr. Knight confirmed that it can be, but those windows are only seen at an angle, as the public right-of-way is at a much lower elevation. He shared the side elevation with the Board for reference. The small window is more than halfway back on the historic portion of the elevation. When something is further back and out of the public right-of-way, the code treats it slightly differently. Another image was shared to highlight the fact that the siding beneath the window has clearly been patched at some point.

Board Member Douglas Stephens referenced the Condition of Approval about the minimum requirements for egress. He asked if the intention is to match the two new windows with the historic window. Mr. Knight confirmed that this is the idea. Board Member Stephens suggested an amendment to the Condition of Approval so there is additional clarity provided. The intention is to match the one historic-sized window that is there, within a couple of inches. The exact size will depend on the window manufacturer. Planner Zollinger wanted to better understand the amendment desired for Condition of Approval #5. Board Member Stephens stated that there can be more clarity provided.

Discussions were had about modified language for Condition of Approval #5. Board Member Puggy Holmgren asked if this used to be a boarding house. Mr. Knight stated that his understanding was that it was originally a boarding house for miners. There is information about that in the historical form of the project. The new condition language was read:

- The windows approved to be expanded shall match the dimensions of the third window on the second level of the north side.

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

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed support for the application. Board Member Holmgren was also supportive of the application. She asked if this will change the designation or if it will still remain a Significant Historic Structure. Chair Scott believed it would remain significant. Board Member Long stated that he is supportive of the request.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the modified Material Deconstruction of the Significant Historic Structure at 615 Woodside Avenue according to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval, as amended:

Findings of Fact:

1. 615 Woodside 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. The Historic Preservation Board approved the Lifting and Material Deconstruction of 615 Woodside on November 6, 2024, to accommodate foundation upgrades, a basement addition, and rehabilitation of the Significant Historic Structure.
4. The Applicant proposes a modification to the Material Deconstruction Final Action Letter.
5. The Applicant proposes enlarging two existing windows to meet egress requirements in dimensions reflective of an existing third window on the secondary (northern) façade.
 - a. The Applicant proposes installing a code-compliant egress window on a secondary (northern) façade for an existing bedroom.
 - b. The Applicant proposes converting a bathroom to a new bedroom, requiring a code-compliant egress window on a secondary (northern) façade.
6. The Land Management Code discourages interior changes that affect the exterior appearance of primary and secondary facades (LMC Section 15-13- 2(B)(2)(a)(8)). LMC Section 15-13-2(B)(2)(d)(1) states Applicants

should maintain and preserve historic window openings, windows, window surrounds, and decorative window features. However, LMC Section 15-13-2(B)(2)(d)(11) provides some flexibility and states it is generally inappropriate to modify windows on the primary façade to accommodate interior changes.

7. The Applicant's proposed modifications to windows are limited to the secondary (northern) façade.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with LMC § 15-11-12.5 *Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction*.
2. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with LMC § 15-13-2 *Regulations for Historic Residential Sites*.

Conditions of Approval

1. Final Building Plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the Historic Preservation Board's March 5, 2025 approval. 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 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.
5. The windows approved to be expanded shall match the dimensions of the third window on the second level of the north side.
6. The Applicant shall update the Historic Preservation Plan to reflect the modification approved. New windows installed on the Historic Structure shall be made of wood.

Board Member Gackle seconded the motion.

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

B. 1455 Woodside Avenue – Relocation of Historic Structure – The Applicant Proposes Removing a 580-square-foot 1960s Rear Addition to Rehabilitate the 1904 Significant Historic Structure 14 Feet Towards the Southeast of the Property in the Recreation Commercial Zoning District in Order to Create Up to Four Lots. PL-23-05777.

Planner Zollinger presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is for Rehabilitation and Relocation at 1455 Woodside Avenue. She reported that 1455 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure built circa 1904 and is in the Recreation Commercial (“RC”) Zoning District on an unusual lot size for historic proportions. After 1941, minor additions were added to the rear. In 1965, a detached two-car garage was constructed. Previously, the Board reached consensus to approve:

- The removal of the 580-square-foot rear 1960s addition to rehabilitate the 1904 Significant Historic Form;
- The restoration of the front porch to reflect the 1904 materials and Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

The Historic Preservation Board is now being asked to discuss the following:

- The relocation of the 1904 Significant Historic Structure to allow for the creation of up to four lots to accommodate the Significant Historic Structure and the construction of up to three new single-family dwellings.

As outlined in the Staff Report, there is a streetscape image that shows the two adjacent historic structures with an approximate width of 55 feet at the front, as viewed off of Woodside Avenue. The existing site of 1455 Woodside Avenue is approximately 103 feet. If the applicant were to subdivide the lot, it could be done without any Historic Preservation Board consideration and create a similarly sized lot of 55 feet, as viewed from Woodside Avenue. Planner Zollinger noted that the applicant submitted several proposed plans for the structure, which are all included in the Staff Report.

Staff continues to recommend that the structure not be relocated, as Staff does not find it complies with the requirements of the LMC for relocation. However, as discussed previously, if the Board is interested in relocation, some items may be considered. For example, the applicant proposed a 49-foot-wide lot. If looking at the similar adjacent historic structures at 1445 and 1439 Woodside Avenue, there is an approximate 12-foot buffer between the structure and the lot lines. If the Board were to consider that, one of the options might be to move the structure to replicate a similar buffer. Additionally, it might be possible to move the historic structure up to comply with setbacks. Planner Zollinger shared an image from the applicant documents that shows a proposed location,

moving the structure 14 feet to the south. To approve the relocation, the Board needs to determine that unique conditions warrant the proposed relocation and/or reorientation on the existing site. Unique conditions include all of the following:

- The historic context of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) has been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interpret the historic character of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) and the Historic District or its present setting; and
- The proposed relocation will not diminish the overall physical integrity of the Historic District or diminish the historical associations used to define the boundaries of the district; and
- The historical integrity and significance of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will not be diminished by relocation and/or reorientation; and
- The potential to preserve the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will be enhanced by its relocation.

Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board approve:

- The removal of the 580-square-foot rear 1960s addition to rehabilitate the 1904 Significant Historic Form;
- The restoration of the front porch to reflect the 1904 materials and Mature Mining Era (1894-1930).

Staff also recommends that the Board direct Staff to draft findings for the relocation.

The applicant representative, Molly Guinan, introduced herself to the Board. The site is a single lot of 9,047 square feet in the RC Zone. It is just smaller than five standard 25x75 Old Town lots. The lot has one historic single-family residence of 515 square feet. The lot is surrounded on three sides by commercial multi-family residences to the north, east, and west. There are two historic homes to the south. As discussed during the last meeting, there is a desire to follow the guidelines of the LMC for future development of the site. The client also wishes to preserve the historic portion of the home.

It was established in the last Historic Preservation Board Meeting that if the house is left in the current location, there are two possible outcomes. The first is that the house can be retained in its current position and an appropriately zoned structure can be built around it, behind it, or next to it. With required setbacks, it would allow for a rough building footprint of 4,249 square feet and a height of 35 feet. This would include transitional elements from the historic to the new build. The other option would be to leave it where it is and subdivide the lot. The house could be retained in its current position and a second or third single-family or commercial residential lot can be added to the north. The single-family resident lots would be restricted to a maximum of 3,750 square feet, which would leave the grandfathered historic lot at 5,297 square feet.

Ms. Guinan explained that the two options create the opportunity for a large commercial or residential structure that does not satisfy the desire of her client to respect the streetscape and historic massing of the house. At the last meeting, the Historic Preservation Board asked them to look at size alternatives. As a result, there was work done to look at the view of the streetscape. There are three historic homes outside of any Historic District, so work was done to mirror the lot upon the center house. The lot at 1439 Woodside Avenue is 3,920 square feet. The subdivision it is part of has a flag lot to the south and west that contains a driveway that sits between the historic lot and its neighboring condominium lots. That driveway is not part of 1439 Woodside Avenue but belongs to the flag lot behind. If that lot is mirrored, it would allow them to move the historic home at 1455 Woodside Avenue towards the south property line and introduce a driveway. This would create a clear delineation on both the south and north of the three historic homes. That would separate the historic homes from the north area.

Ms. Guinan reported that there are several options included in the Meeting Materials Packet. Each option presented is based on the idea of moving the historic home closer to the other two historic homes and creating a driveway to the north. In the materials submitted, the property to the north was left blank. Ms. Guinan explained that the setbacks are based on lot square footage, so various options have been shown that match the neighboring square footage. The goal with the options is to address the main concern of protecting the historic elements and streetscape. A conscious decision was made to show the volume of the north lot without specifying what that lot might become in the future. The Planning Department asked for some options, so those are included.

The potential lot configurations were reviewed. Ms. Guinan shared Proposed Plan A, which would allow for four lots. By creating four lots, the historic site would be 2,771 square feet, and each of the northern lots would be 25x86. There would be the same height restriction of 27 feet. Proposed Plan C was shared. The option is to move the historic house, create a drive or parking area to the north, and divide the upper lots. Those lots could be evenly divided or there could be a smaller lot next to the house and a larger lot at the top. This would be a way of “ramping up” to the commercial.

Board Member Beatiebrox asked about the footage on the street side for each of the parcels. Ms. Guinan stated that the two northern lots would be 32 and the historic lot would be 38.5. Discussions were had about other measurements. It was reiterated that the existing driveway belongs to the lot behind rather than to the historic home.

Board Member Dalton Gackle asked about the distance the historic home is proposed to be moved. Ms. Guinan reported that in the Meeting Materials Packet, there are several examples shown. The square footage of the lot dictates how far the setbacks are. Chair Scott asked about the different scenarios that have been shared. Ms. Guinan noted that one of the sticking points in the last meeting was the request for 14 feet. It does not necessarily have to be 14 feet, so in the materials, there were variations presented.

Board Member Stephens asked about the last lot division where the middle lot was a little bit narrower. He wanted to know what the frontages were on the two new lots. Ms. Guinan stated that the single-family residence is 25 feet. Board Member Stephens asked if that would trigger a 3-foot side yard setback or a 5-foot side yard setback. It was stated that it would be three feet for that lot size. There would be a 5-foot setback for 39 feet.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to better understand the idea of “ramping up.” Ms. Guinan clarified that their preference is to have four single-family lots. However, during the last discussion, the Board noted that the commercial to the north, west, and east overshadows the historic lot. If all of the lots were single-family, then the end lot would be overshadowed. They were asked whether it was possible to blend the uses from the historic site to the surrounding commercial so it didn’t appear overshadowed. Board Member Beatlebrox recalled there was a discussion at the last meeting about whether three or four single-family lots would correct the mistakes of the past, which allowed certain density in an area with historic homes. She is not certain the Historic Preservation Board has an interest in requiring the “ramping up” concept that has been presented.

Chair Scott noted that as long as he has been on the Board, relocation has not been allowed. This is an opportunity for the applicant and Board to have input to ensure that whatever moves forward blends in appropriately. Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there is an option for three lots as opposed for four. Ms. Guinan confirmed that there is an option for three lots to the north as well as three individual lots. Discussions were had about the setback on the historic home and the different options presented to the Board.

Board Member Stephens pointed out that if there are two equal-sized lots, there will be two buildings of equal massing. On the other hand, if there is a middle lot at 25 feet, it will have a certain architecture to it that is defined by a 25-foot-wide lot. The next size lot that is 39 feet wide can have some architectural interest there. As a result, there will be some different architecture. Something the Board does not typically deal with is historic homes outside of the Historic District. The fact that this is in the RC Zone makes it a different application to consider. There is a desire to protect historic homes in the area.

Ms. Guinan reported that the RC Zone was put there to support the resort base. The condominiums that have been built there were not a mistake, but were intentional for that zone. The three historic homes are the outliers in the zone. There is a desire to respect what is there as well as what the zone intends. The Board further discussed the RC Zone.

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

Director Ward provided background information on this section of code and how it has changed over the years. In 2009, the criteria for relocation were different. There were allowances at that time if historic structures encroached on adjacent properties. Since then, the code has been amended to allow for setback exceptions, where those encroachments can remain and the historic sites can remain in their original

encroachment. At that time, the Planning Director and Chief Building Official had the authority to make a determination about whether there were unique conditions specific to the site. In 2012, that criteria remained in place, but a footnote was added to state that the Historic Preservation Board would make a determination if there was an appeal.

In 2015, the code was rewritten and there were some fairly substantial updates. It stated that the new site shall convey a character similar to that of the historic site in terms of the scale of neighboring buildings, materials, site relationships, geography, and age. It also stated that integrity will not be diminished. The intention was to make sure all of that was maintained with relocation. At that time, there was also a requirement for the applicant to show that all other alternatives were reasonably considered. In 2016, those additional considerations were removed from the code. Director Ward explained that some of the proposed relocation applications in the past were reviewed under different standards.

Planner Zollinger reported that since 2016, there have been three relocations that the Board may be familiar with. This includes 1323 (also known as 1353) Park Avenue. In 2017, it was approved for relocation. Originally, it was in the RC Zoning District. The structure itself was in poor condition and was required to be taken down due to safety issues. When it was taken down, the Board approved relocation from the RC Zone to the Historic Residential – Medium Zoning District. The Board found that moving it promoted better context for that historic site. Another example is 569 Park Avenue in 2022. The Board approved the structure to be moved approximately four feet to the north, as the Board found this abated the demolition of the historic structure. The most recent example was in 2023, at 330 and 360 Daly Avenue. Those were accessory mining structures, one of which was a garage that was full of historic materials. That was partially on City property and partially on private property. It was also in poor condition and going to be required to be braced or fixed. The Board found that since the previous single-family dwelling had been removed, there was no longer context for the site. It was moved 10 feet off private property onto City property to preserve the historic structures and comply with setbacks.

Board Member Beatebrox noted that it was previously stated by the applicant representative that if the lot was divided into thirds, the request for relocation would still be 14 feet. However, it was originally divided into fourths. Ms. Guinan explained that the only parking is in front of the house, which would sit in front of the historic porch. That does not seem like the best option. When it was decided to mirror 1439 Woodside Avenue, the driveway to the north was considered instead of parking in front. That would then move the house to the full extent. It would still be on a 3-foot or 5-foot setback on the south side, depending on the option selected. This would allow the driveway to be the buffer between the historic property and whatever development happens to the north.

Chair Scott reported that he walked the property earlier in the day. By moving the historic structure 14 feet, he believed the rhythm would be different. 1455 Woodside Avenue would be brought a lot closer to the other two southern neighbors. Ms. Guinan reiterated that there is a driveway between 1439 and 1445 Woodside Avenue, so there is a buffer.

In this case, it would be ideal for the buffer to be between 1455 Woodside Avenue and what happens to the north. Having the driveways on the outsides would be beneficial.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked about past discussions related to rear parking. Ms. Guinan reported that this is addressed in the various options. The driveway could access the back so there could be parking in the rear. Access would be from Woodside Avenue.

The LMC language was shared from 15-11-13 – Relocation and/or Reorientation of a Historic Building or Historic Structure. A(3) includes the following language:

- For Significant sites, at least one of the following shall be met:
 - The proposed relocation and/or reorientation will abate demolition of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) on the Site; or
 - The Planning Director and Chief Building Official determine that the building is threatened in its present setting because of hazardous conditions and the preservation of the building will be enhanced by relocating it; or
 - The Historic Preservation Board, with input from the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official, determines that unique conditions warrant the proposed relocation and/or reorientation on the existing Site. Unique conditions shall include all of the following:
 - The historic context of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) has been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interpret the historic character of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) and the Historic District or its present setting; and
 - The proposed relocation will not diminish the overall physical integrity of the Historic District or diminish the historical associations used to define the boundaries of the district; and
 - The historical integrity and significance of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will not be diminished by relocation and/or reorientation; and
 - The potential to preserve the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) will be enhanced by its relocation.

Staff does not find that the first two items would be met. Only one of the three needs to be met, but if it is the third one, then all four of the subitems need to be met. Chair Scott agreed that the first two points do not apply, so the Board is looking at Item C and the four subitems listed. Board Member Gackle suggested reviewing the criteria one at a time. Ms. Guinan asked about the items that specifically reference the Historic District. Director Ward believes the context of the first item relates to the structure and the site while the second is about the Historic District. The second item may not be applicable.

The first item was reviewed in more detail, which includes the following language:

- The historic context of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) has been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interpret

the historic character of the Historic Building(s) and/or Structure(s) and the Historic District or its present setting.

Board Member Gackle noted that it would be possible to argue the proposal meets the criteria based on the fact that it sits in a unique RC Zone. Based on what has been constructed around it, the original historic context has been radically altered over the years. He felt that any relocation scenario would be applicable here. Board Member Stephens pointed out that the Board is looking at a historic house, but this is a unique situation. He would like to look at this in the context of preserving the historic house and the sense of history caused by the three homes next to each other. Board Member Stephens referenced the last proposal that was shown, where there was the historic house, a 25-foot-wide lot, and a 39-foot-wide lot. That would mitigate the massing.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked why Board Member Stephens was supportive of the “ramping up” proposal. She is not sure why that is needed. Board Member Stephens pointed out that there is only so much that can be done with 39 feet. However, that scenario will result in different architectural opportunities there. Director Ward mentioned the fourth item on the list, which is the potential to preserve the historic building or structure as it will be enhanced by the relocation. In the Board’s consideration of the relocation, it is important to look at what this means for the future context of the site. Through this review process, the Board is looking for that compatibility. Ms. Guinan explained that she does not want to see the site devalued. The main goal is to protect what is historic. There are a lot of options, given that this is in the RC Zone. Board Member Stephens acknowledged that the Board is not able to restrict those choices. Whatever is built on there must fit within the existing LMC and go through that process.

Ms. Guinan reported that there is one option that has not been discussed. There are examples of condominium plats with historic homes that have been built around. This could be an option on this site as well. There is potential on a site of that size to have a historic home with a condominium plat. Board Member Stephens believed that even if there was a condominium plat, the issue would remain, which is how the historic home fits in. The intention is to protect the three historic homes that are in the area.

Board Member Beatlebrox understands there would be stipulations about the parcels to the north. She asked to review those. Planner Zollinger explained that in the Staff Report, there were a few options outlined. Those would have to be agreed upon by the owner and the Board. It is possible that there could be a requirement about the kind of development that would be on the lot and the maximum building footprint. There are no Conditions of Approval or Findings of Fact drafted for that. However, once the Board provides direction, those can be reviewed by the owner and the Board. It can continue to be discussed the next time this is reviewed by the Historic Preservation Board.

Chair Scott commented that the width of the property sets the tone for what can architecturally be designed. He expressed support for what was previously mentioned by Board Member Stephens. Board Member Holmgren agreed. Director Ward believed

Chair Scott was referencing the 39-foot width for the historic, 25 feet for the middle lot, and 39 feet for the third lot. Ms. Guinan reiterated that in the last proposal, the north lot was left blank. The Planning Department then came back and asked to put some different options on there. The preference is to focus on the historic lot rather than the northern lots. Board Member Stephens wants to make sure there is comfort with the massing.

Director Ward further reviewed the four items the Board is considering. Board Member Gackle asked about the fourth item and whether the Board needs to direct Staff to work with the applicant on some kind of agreement. City Attorney, Mark Harrington, believes the applicant representative will need to speak to her client to determine whether those kinds of conditions are acceptable. Board Member Gackle wanted to understand if this item should be continued to a future meeting. Planner Zollinger explained that if the Board has any conditions, she can make note of those. Between this meeting and the next meeting, she will prepare a Draft Final Action Letter based on the direction received from the Historic Preservation Board. If it is approved for relocation, it would include Conditions of Approval. Those conditions would need to be reviewed and agreed upon by both the Historic Preservation Board and the property owner. The Draft Final Action Letter would not be set in stone until the Board took final action.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed concerns about potential future scenarios. She stressed the importance of appropriate Conditions of Approval. Board Member Stephens noted that the LMC defines what can be built on the two lots. Ms. Guinan reported that if it was a commercial lot, then there would be a deeper setback. There is something in the code that says it would need to have a step back in the façade as well. Director Ward clarified that in the RC Zone, there is a section that is specific to single-family and duplex uses. It incorporates the underlying zoning of the Historic Residential – 1. A lot of what will be required depends on what the future use will be. Chair Scott asked about potential Conditions of Approval. Director Ward believes there is consensus on the 39-foot, 25-foot, and 39-foot lots. The conditions could be attached to the plat. One of the reasons the applicant has come to the Board first is because the plan is to move through the Plat Amendment process. Through this evaluation of the four criteria, it is possible to lay the foundation of what the parameters should be for the relocation of the historic home.

Board Member Stephens likes the idea of moving the driveway to the north and providing an additional buffer there. He would like to see that included as a condition, as it will keep the three homes in a more historical context. Board Member Gackle is not certain the driveway needs to be one of the Conditions of Approval. Board Member Stephens pointed out that without the driveway on the north side, it would need to be put on the south side. If the historic house is relocated, he would rather it be moved a little bit further to keep the historical context with the other historic homes that exist in the area.

Board Member Gackle asked if a motion is needed to direct Staff on the next steps. Attorney Harrington suggested that there be two motions. One would be to approve the Draft Final Action Letter in the Meeting Materials Packet. Alternatively, there could be a combined Draft Final Action Letter created for the next meeting. The second motion

would be to direct Staff to prepare Conditions of Approval related to the three lot sizes (39 feet, 25 feet, and 39 feet) with established setbacks for the resulting historic structure, the subdivision as outlined by Director Ward, and the driveway to the north. There was support for the process outlined by Attorney Harrington on the two separate motions.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the removal of a 580-square-foot 1960s addition and restoration of the front porch materials, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. 1455 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic T/L cottage constructed circa 1904.
2. The site is in the Recreation Commercial Zoning District.
3. The site is a metes-and-bounds parcel approximately 83 feet in depth and 103- feet in width, 9,047 square feet.
4. The Significant Historic Structure is 1,065.44 square feet.
5. The Significant Historic Structure is 17.3 feet from the southeastern property line, and the Applicant proposes to move it 14.3 feet towards the southeastern property line.

Material Deconstruction

6. There is an addition on the rear of the Significant Historic Structure constructed in the 1960s. The Applicant proposes to remove the addition and restore the Significant Historic Structure to the 1904 form.
7. The 1960s addition, while over 50 years old, does not contribute to the historic significance of the site because it does not represent the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930) form. The Applicant proposes to rehabilitate the Significant Historic Site to its 1904 form.
8. Removal of the 1960s addition will allow the Applicant to construct an addition, which will be subject to LMC § 15-13-2, *Regulations for Historic Residential Sites*, including a required transitional element that will separate the 1904 form from the addition, and will require compatibility in materials and massing with the 1904 form.
9. No historic material from the 1904 form is proposed to be removed and the removal of the non-historic addition complies with LMC § 15-11-12.5(A)(b), *Historic Preservation Board Review For Material Deconstruction*.

Reconstruction of Porch

10. There is an existing historic porch form with materials that have been replaced – the wood base was replaced with a concrete pad and the wood posts were replaced and are now failing. The Applicant proposes to remove the porch and restore the wood materials.
11. LMC § 15-13-2(A) states, “Owners are encouraged to reproduce missing historic elements that were original to the building, but have been removed.” LMC § 15- 13-2(B)(2)(g)(4) states, “Replacement porches shall be constructed of materials and in styles that are compatible with the structure to which they are attached. When possible, the reconstructed porch shall be based on physical or documentary evidence; when no such evidence exists, the design shall be based on historic porches found on comparable historic structures.” The proposed plans comply with these sections because the Applicant proposes to reconstruct the front porch with appropriate materials for the time.

Conclusions of Law

1. The removal of the 1960s addition to the Significant Historic Structure, as conditioned, complies with the requirements of Land Management Code § 15-11- 12.5 *Material Deconstruction*.
2. The restoration of the Significant Historic Structure porch, as conditioned, complies with the requirements of Land Management Code § 15-13-2 *Regulations for Historic Residential Sites*.

Conditions of Approval for Material Deconstruction and Reconstruction of the Historic Porch

1. The Applicant must complete Historic District Design Review prior to submitting a Building Permit.
2. The Applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee, in accordance with LMC § 15-11-19, to be recorded with the Summit County Recorder’s Office prior to submitting a Building Permit.
3. The front porch shall be constructed of materials and in a style that is compatible with the Significant Historic Structure. Replacement elements shall exactly match the historic elements in size, dimensions, form, profile, and material. The concrete porch shall be replaced with wood.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

Following the vote on the Draft Final Action Letter, the Board discussed the Staff direction. Board Member Beatlebrox made a motion to direct Staff to prepare a Draft Final Action Letter and Board Member Gackle seconded the motion. Attorney Harrington noted that it is possible to specify that it could be subject to ratification by the Chair. Since there is not another Historic Preservation Board Meeting until May 7, 2025, approval from the Chair would prevent the applicant from having to wait until that meeting date.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to direct Staff to prepare a Draft Final Action Letter delineating that the historic house can be moved to a location where there is a 3-foot side yard setback and a 12.6-foot front yard setback. The rest of the property will be divided into two lots (for a result of 39 feet, 25 feet, and 39 feet). The letter will also include conditions related to the subdivision and the driveway location on the north side. Approval is subject to the Chair's review of the Draft Final Action Letter, consistent with the direction received from the Board. Board Member Gackle seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board took a short break before hearing the next item.

C. 1003 Norfolk Avenue – Modification – The Applicant Proposes to Modify the Material Deconstruction Approved by the Historic Preservation Board to Remove the 1941 Rear Addition, Convert the Detached Accessory Building to a Single-Car Garage, and Construct a Rear Addition to a Landmark Historic Site. PL-25-06420.

Planner I, Meredith Covey, presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is for a modification at 1003 Norfolk Avenue. This is a Landmark Historic Structure located in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. It was constructed around 1900 and has additions from 1907 and 1941. The Historic Preservation Board approved Material Deconstruction in 2023. In 2023, the Board approved the following items:

- Restoring the 1900 footprint;
- Removing the overbuilt gambrel roof;
- Replacing 11 windows;
- Constructing a basement addition;
- Restoring the Historic Accessory Building on the site.

The applicant now proposes to modify that approval to restore the 1907 footprint instead of the 1900 footprint. Additionally, there is a request to lift the structure to construct the basement addition and repair the foundation. Planner Covey reviewed some of the proposed Conditions of Approval. She read for the following language to the Board:

- Condition of Approval #4:
 - The applicant shall provide the City with a Financial Guarantee, in accordance with LMC § 15-11-9, to be recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office prior to submitting a Building Permit application.
- Condition of Approval #8:
 - 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 #9:
 - The gambrel roof shall be removed and replaced with a roof pitch that is compliant with Historic District Regulations.
- Condition of Approval #10:
 - The basement addition shall not raise the Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation above grade.

The applicant representative asked that mention be made to Condition of Approval #17:

- The replacement windows shall exactly match the historic window in size, dimensions, glazing pattern, depth, profile, and material.

Planner Covey explained that the windows that are currently on the structure are not original to the structure. The windows would be replaced in a manner consistent with what was originally there as opposed to what is there now. Applicant representative, Jonathan DeGray, apologized that the item is back before the Historic Preservation Board. The 1900 footprint was approved, but the design has been focused on the 1907 footprint. He apologized for any confusion that resulted in this item being on the agenda.

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

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that this is a clean proposal and it is clear what needs to be done. She feels what has been proposed meets all of the necessary criteria. Chair Scott read the project summary language included in the Draft Final Action Letter:

- The Applicant proposes to remove the 1941 rear addition, lift the Landmark Historic Structure for a basement addition and foundation upgrades, convert the detached accessory building to a single-car garage, and construct a rear addition to 1003 Norfolk Avenue, a Landmark Historic Site.

Board Member Gackle pointed out that some of the items were already approved, so a motion is not needed for the entire project summary. Director Ward clarified that the previous approval expired. The language includes what was previously approved and the modification. There will be a one-year time period that this approval is active. Attorney Harrington explained that it is possible to reference approval of the Material Deconstruction in accordance with the Draft Final Action Letter dated March 5, 2025.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to APPROVE the Material Deconstruction for 1003 Norfolk Avenue, according to the following Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval:

Findings of Fact:

1. 1003 Norfolk Avenue is in the Historic Residential – 1 (HR-1) Zoning District.
2. The Site is designated a Landmark Historic Site on Park City's Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The Property is also known as Lot 1 of the 1003 Norfolk Avenue Amended Plat, approved on September 2, 2021.
4. Development on this Site has spanned across three of Park City's designated Historic eras, including the Settlement and Mining Boom Era (1868-1893), the Mature Mining Era (1894-1930), and the Mining Decline and Emergence of Recreation Industry Era (1931-1962).
5. The house first appears on the 1900 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map as a simple, one-story T/L Cross-wing cottage-style house with a single-story L-shaped front porch and footprint to the southwest corner of the T cottage.
6. The 1907 Sanborn Fire Insurance Map shows an addition to the west and enclosed the southern side of the L-shaped porch.
7. Another addition was constructed sometime after 1941 to the Structure.
8. On November 1, 2020, the Planning Department received a complete Historic District Design Review (HDDR) application to restore the 1900 footprint, the 1900 wrap-around porch, and the 1900 roof form, as well as convert the accessory building to a garage and construct a rear addition.
9. The Historic Preservation Board approved Material Deconstruction at 1003 Norfolk on February 3, 2021.
10. The Applicant obtained Historic District Design Review approval from the Planning Director on April 7, 2022.
11. This approval expired on April 7, 2023. The Applicant did not seek an extension prior to the expiration of the approval.
12. On September 5, 2023, the Applicant submitted a new HDDR application with the same proposal.

13. On November 1, 2023, the Historic Preservation Board approved Material Deconstruction at 1003 Norfolk Avenue which included the October 27, 2022, plan set for the proposed remodel and addition.
14. On January 30, 2025, the Applicant submitted a Modification Application.
15. The Applicant's proposal for Material Deconstruction of 1003 Norfolk Avenue, a Landmark Historic Structure, is to:
 - a. Remove the post-1941 328-square-foot rear addition;
 - b. Restore the c. 1907 1,021-square-foot footprint of the Landmark Historic Structure;
 - c. Lift the Landmark Historic Structure to construct a basement addition and new foundation;
 - d. Add a 497-square-foot rear addition;
 - e. Remove the gambrel roof form;
 - f. Replace 11 windows on the Landmark Historic Structure;
 - g. Restore an existing 205-square-foot Historic Accessory Building located in the northern front corner of the Lot and converting into a single-car detached garage.
16. The Applicant proposes to construct a rear addition in place of the 1941 addition, as well as a basement addition. The connection to the proposed rear addition will be made at the rear façade of the Historic Structure and is located on a tertiary, non-character defining, façade.
17. Pursuant to LMC § 15-11-12 the proposed addition will be reviewed by the Planning Department for compliance with LMC Chapter 15-5 *Architectural Review*, LMC Chapter 15-11 *Historic Preservation*, and LMC Chapter 15-13 *Regulations for Historic Districts and Historic Sites* and LMC § 15-13-2(B)(4) - *Additions to Primary Structures for Historic Residential Sites* through the HDDR review process.
18. The Applicant's Physical Conditions Report indicates the joists, posts, and beams are deteriorating in the crawlspace and in some areas, the foundation is so buried the wooden framing material is sitting directly on grade.
19. Approval of the Material Deconstruction will allow the Applicant to stabilize the Landmark Historic Structure with a new foundation and construct a basement addition.

20. The Historic Preservation Board reviews Material Deconstruction requests for compliance with LMC § 15-13-2 *Regulations for Historic Residential Sites*.
21. The overbuilt roof structures lack weather barriers and are not sealed where new and old roofs meet. The Applicant cites concern over the lack of a weather barrier on the roof compromising the integrity of the Structure.
22. The new roof form will be required to comply with the requirements outlined in LMC § 15-2.2-5(C) *Roof Pitch Regulations in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District*. Pursuant to LMC § 15-13-2(B)(4) - *Additions to Primary Structures* the addition shall be placed so as to not obscure, detract from, or modify historic roof forms.
23. The Applicant also proposes to replace all 11 windows on the Structure, seven of which are 50 years old or more.
24. The Applicant's Physical Conditions Report indicates some of these windows may be inoperable and some components have suffered water damage.
25. The third-party determination states that upon evaluation the existing windows, which are more than 50 years old, are aluminum slides and non-operable picture windows and are not the original windows. The determination states that the original windows were double-hung wood windows. The Applicant proposes to replace the windows with historically accurate jambs and sash to accommodate the existing openings and contemporary energy standards.
26. Staff published a notice on the City's website and the Utah Public Notice website, and posted a notice to the property on February 12, 2025. Staff mailed a courtesy notice to property owners within 100 feet on February 12, 2025. The Park Record published notice on February 12, 2025.

Conclusions of Law

1. The proposal 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 March 5, 2025 approval for the Material Deconstruction of the 1941 addition and the siding enclosing

a portion of the original L-shaped front porch. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved Material Deconstruction 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 provide the City with a Financial Guarantee, in accordance with LMC § 15-11-9, to be recorded with the Summit County Recorder's Office prior to submitting a Building Permit application.
5. An encroachment agreement may be required prior to the issuance of a Building Permit for projects utilizing soils nails that encroach onto neighboring properties.
6. A Soils Report completed by a geotechnical engineer as well as a temporary shoring plan, if applicable, will be required at the time of Building Permit application.
7. The site shall be re-graded so that all water drains away from the Structure and does not enter the foundation.
8. 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.
9. The gambrel roof shall be removed and replaced with a roof pitch that is compliant with Historic District Regulations.
10. The basement addition shall not raise the Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation above grade.
11. The Historic Site shall be returned to original grade following construction of the foundation with no more than two feet of the new foundation visible above Final Grade on the primary and secondary facades.
12. 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.

13. The form, material, and detailing of a new foundation shall be similar to foundations of nearby historic structures.
14. 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.
15. Historic Structures which 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 re-inspect and approve the cribbing and/or shoring alterations within five (5) days of any relocation or alteration to the cribbing and/or shoring.
16. 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.
17. The replacement windows shall exactly match the historic window in size, dimensions, glazing pattern, depth, profile, and material

Board Member Long seconded the motion.

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

D. Materials and Opacity for Non-Historic Structures in the Historic Districts – Land Management Code Amendment – Consider an Ordinance Approving an Amendment to the Land Management Code to Remove the Opacity Requirement for New Residential Infill Development in the Historic Districts and Establish a New Process for which Non-Historic Materials Proposed for New Residential Infill Can be Considered for Compatibility with the Historic Districts. PL-25-06407.

Planning Project Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that the item relates to materials and opacity for non-historic structures in the Historic Districts. These LMC amendments relate to residential infill in Historic Districts. The call for more flexibility in materials and paint opacity for new residential structures and additions came from residents and property owners in Historic Districts and design professionals who have worked on projects within the Historic Districts. The proposed updates to the Historic District Design Standards have been discussed at several Historic Preservation Board Meetings over the last year and a half. It was most recently discussed at the February 5, 2025, Work Session. In January 2025, Staff held a Focus Group with local design professionals. That Focus Group helped to narrow down some of the main issues.

In past discussions, the Board consensus around regulations for historic structures has not changed. This has to do with regulations around the preservation of historic materials and the paint opacity requirement for historic structures. Those are not proposed to change as part of this process. During the Work Session last month, the Board provided clear direction to Staff to move forward with updates to the LMC to remove the paint opacity requirement for new residential infill and to establish an Advisory Committee. The Committee will create a list of approved alternative or non-historic materials that can be used for additions to historic structures and for new residential construction. There are universal restrictions on certain materials in the code, which are prohibited City-wide.

Manager Martin explained that there are several reasons to provide flexibility:

- Provide differentiation to distinguish old from new;
- Flexibility in materials allows for creativity and innovation in design, providing interest and a sense of uniqueness;
- Overly restrictive standards can result in a monotonous, unimaginative, and characterless pattern of development;
- Historic District Regulations emphasize compatibility with form ensuring that new residential infill shares fundamental similarities with historic buildings.

There are roughly 1,100 residential properties in the Historic Districts and 405 residential and commercial properties are listed on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. With non-historic properties outnumbering historic sites in the Historic Districts, it is critical that non-historic structures maintain compatibility with historic mining-era structures. The General Plan provides a clear directive to preserve the integrity, mass, scale, compatibility, and

historic fabric of the nationally and locally designated historic resources and districts for future generations. It also talks about maintaining character with compatible infill development and additions. Historic Residential Zoning District regulations help to shape new residential infill and additions to be compatible with historic sites:

- Minimum and maximum lot size in keeping with traditional historic lots;
- Size and location of structures on a lot;
- Building height and massing;
- Roof form.

The existing regulations for additions were reviewed and are as follows:

- The volume of the addition shall be broken into modules that reflect the scale of those components seen on the historic structure;
- Building components and materials used on additions shall be similar in scale and size to those found on the historic building;
- Window shapes, patterns, and proportions found on the historic building should be reflected in the new addition;
- Windows, doors, and other openings shall be of sizes and proportions similar to those found on nearby historic structures;
- The solid-to-void relationship and detailing of an addition shall be compatible with the historic structure.

While the Historic District Regulations emphasize compatibility with form, the General Plan and LMC Universal Regulations for development in the Historic Districts clearly states that new construction should be differentiated and should not imitate historic structures. It should be compatible and complementary. One of the ways that differentiation can be achieved is by allowing external wood siding used on new construction to be stained or treated with a finish that is not opaque. That would differentiate from historic structures that were traditionally painted opaque. As discussed in the Work Session, there are treatments for wood finishes. The code amendments state that certain wood finishes or treatments that are not found to be compatible with the Historic Districts will be listed in the Master List of Non-Historic Materials and Finishes.

In addition to allowing non-opaque wood siding, the proposed amendments would allow flexibility in the use of new or non-historic materials by establishing a new process. The Historic Preservation Board may appoint an Advisory Committee to help guide the creation of the Master List of Non-Historic Materials and Finishes, which would allow for new residential infill and additions in the Historic Districts. Staff recommends the Advisory Committee be made up of two Historic Preservation Board Members, three design professionals familiar with the Park City Historic Districts, the Planning Department's Historic Preservation Team, and the City's Historic Preservation consultant. The Advisory Committee, along with the Historic Preservation Board, would regularly review and periodically update the list of materials to ensure that it includes the most up-to-date materials in the industry. Any new materials would be evaluated.

New, non-historic materials considered through this new process will be judged on criteria related to durability, sustainability, and compatibility. This includes the following:

- Longevity (50-year lifespan);
- Energy performance;
- Durable in this climate;
- Fire resistance;
- Environmental benefit and impact (high recycled content, locally sourced, life-cycle impact, or cradle-to-grave impact);
- Compatibility with the character of the Historic District.

Manager Martin reviewed the next steps with the Historic Preservation Board:

- Select two Historic Preservation Board Members to bring the LMC amendments forward to the Planning Commission on April 23, 2025, and to the City Council on June 5, 2025;
- If the recommended Code Amendments are adopted, Planning Staff will return with a proposed process to establish the first Advisory Committee;
- Staff will also recommend documenting new materials through photographs and evaluation of performance over time to ensure long-term compatibility within the Historic District.

There is a Staff recommendation included in the Staff Report, which is as follows:

- Review the proposed Land Management Code Amendments that:
 - Remove the requirement for new residential buildings in the Historic District to be painted opaque;
 - Create a process for establishing a list of non-historic materials that may be used on non-historic Structures and additions to Historic Structures that is reviewed and approved by the Historic Preservation Board.
- Conduct a public hearing;
- Consider forwarding a positive recommendation for the Planning Commission's consideration on April 23, 2025, based on the Draft Ordinance (Exhibit A).

Board Member Beatlebrox asked what will be forwarded to the Planning Commission. Manager Martin clarified that the LMC amendments outlined in the Staff Report and Draft Ordinance are proposed to be forwarded. Those amendments would establish the authority for the Historic Preservation Board to create the Advisory Committee. Board Member Beatlebrox expressed support for what has been proposed. The Staff Report was clear and well-written. Chair Scott believes what is in front of the Board is a recommendation to move forward with the LMC amendments, as outlined. Additionally, the Board needs to choose two Board Members to attend those future meetings. Board Member Stephens asked why it is necessary to have Board Members present. Manager Martin explained that the Board Members asked to participate in those meetings will be

the liaisons. Director Ward clarified that whoever is available and interested in providing information about the Board process can attend. The intention is to provide the perspective of the Historic Preservation Board to the Commission and Council.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing.

Cole Knight stated that he is an architect with Elliott Workgroup. He is grateful to see this process evolving and moving forward. After reading through the language in the code, it makes a lot of sense, but he asked the Board to consider some suggestions. As far as a Master List of Non-Historic Materials and Finishes, there will likely need to be a balance so the list of materials is more categorical rather than product-specific. He suggested thinking about broader performance criteria for the overall product classifications. There could be some examples provided to illustrate what might meet the criteria. When it comes to the meeting and review process, it says "periodically" in the code, which is somewhat ambiguous. He would imagine the process would take place annually or bi-annually. It was suggested that something with a little more specificity be included there.

There were no further comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the LMC Code Amendments and select Board Members to present. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

Discussions were had about the Board Members who will present at the Planning Commission and City Council Meetings. Board Member Stephens and Board Member Holmgren believed they could attend the Commission and Council Meetings.

7. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Gackle seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 7:10 p.m.