



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF MAY 7, 2025**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott - Chair, Lola Beattiebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Dalton Gackle, Douglas Stephens, Katie Noble

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Michelle Kellogg, City Recorder; Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner I; Meredith Covey; Planner I; Dave Thacker, Chief Building Official; Elissa Martin, Planning Project Manager

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER AT 5:00 P.M.

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

2. ROLL CALL

Chair Scott conducted a roll call and noted that all Board Members are present with the exception of Board Member John Hutchings. Chair Scott was attending virtually.

3. SWEARING-IN CEREMONY

A. Swearing-In Ceremony for Dalton Gackle, Douglas Stephens, Katie Noble, and Randy Scott.

City Recorder, Michelle Kellogg, asked Dalton Gackle, Douglas Stephens, Katie Noble, and Randy Scott to stand for the Swearing In Ceremony. Chair Scott thanked Board Member Stephens and Board Member Gackle for continuing to serve on the Board.

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

4.1 Historic Preservation Board Chair Election – Pursuant to Land Management Code Section 15-11-3, the Historic Preservation Board Will Elect One of Its Members to Serve as Chair for a Term of One Year.

Chair Scott explained that the Historic Preservation Board needs to look at electing a new Chair. Approximately one year ago, he was appointed, but he previously served another term. Board Member Stephens asked if there is something in the Land Management

Code (“LMC”) that limits how long someone can serve as Chair. This was confirmed. Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that the meeting agenda mentions the election of a new Chair. The Historic Preservation Board can also consider a Chair Pro Tem as well. Board Member Stephens pointed out that the City Attorney previously stated that it is not possible to appoint a Chair Pro Tem, as a Chair Pro Tem needs to be elected each time the situation arises. Board Member Gackle believed that Chair Scott was ineligible to serve as Chair again because he served as Chair two years in a row.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to ELECT Douglas Stephens as the Chair of the Historic Preservation Board. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

Following the election of the new Historic Preservation Board Chair, Director Ward shared Staff communications. For the General Plan work, the City is now entering the final phase of the Draft Recommended Plan. There will be a final community meeting hosted on Tuesday, May 13, 2025, at the Park City Library from 5:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Planner I, Jacob Klopfenstein, reported that in February, the Historic Preservation Board considered a few nominees for the annual Historic Preservation Award and awarded 517 Park Avenue. After that meeting, the Planning Department went through a procurement process and selected a local artist to create the art piece that depicts the award-winning property. The plan is to unveil the final art piece to the Mayor and City Council during the meeting next week on May 15, 2025. May has previously been Historic Preservation Month in Park City, so there is a plan to present a Resolution declaring May as Historic Preservation Month in Park City for City Council consideration at the May 15, 2025, meeting. Historic Preservation Board Members are encouraged to attend the meeting.

Board Member Gackle shared a disclosure related to Item 7(A) on the Historic Preservation Board Meeting agenda. He had some contact with the client in his capacity working at the Park City Museum. Some general information was shared, but he did not ask for specific details, since this item would eventually come before the Board. For Item 7(B) on the Historic Preservation Board Meeting agenda, there was some communication as part of his work at the Park City Museum. There were some historical research questions. He directed them to the LMC and provided some research. Board Member Gackle reported that each year, Preservation Utah releases a list of Most Endangered Historic Places. The list for 2025 was released yesterday and he encouraged Board Members to review it, because last year, there were a few Park City locations that made the list.

5. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

6. MINUTES APPROVAL

6.1 Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from March 5, 2025.

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

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

7. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 176 Main Street – Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Proposes to Deconstruct a Landmark Historic Structure in the Historic Residential - 2 Sub-Zone B Zoning District and Reconstruct the Structure with an Attached Addition. PL-25-06472.

Planner I, Meredith Covey, presented the Staff Report and explained that the application is for Material Deconstruction at 176 Main Street. She reported that 176 Main Street is a Landmark Historic Structure in the Historic Residential – 2 Subzone B (“HR-2B”) Zoning District and is known as the Centennial House or the Durkin Boarding House. Planner Covey shared some photographs provided by the applicant. The first photo is of the original structure, which was constructed around 1900, and on the bottom is the current structure, which has ornamental elements that were added sometime after 1978. The Existing Conditions Survey was reviewed, which shows the utility easement and flume easement through the rear of the site. The Floodplain Map was shared. Any construction on the site will be required to comply with floodplain regulations.

On March 12, 2025, the Planning Commission approved the Centennial Plat Amendment to create a lot for the Historic Landmark Site. The plat is not yet recorded, but recordation is required prior to Building Permit submittal. The structure as it exists currently has been vacant for quite some time. Planner Covey reported that the applicant submitted a Physical Conditions Report as part of their application. It outlines the condition of the structure, including damage from the elements, animals, squatters, and lack of maintenance over time. She shared a rendering of the proposed plans as viewed from Main Street, which were submitted by the applicant. The applicant proposes:

- Deconstructing the Landmark Historic Structure;
- Constructing a new foundation;
- Reconstructing the Landmark Historic Structure using salvaged and replacement material to match what exists;
- Constructing an addition on the secondary (north) and tertiary (east) facades, as well as a basement addition.

Staff recommends Condition of Approval #31, which states that the north façade will be panelized as part of this proposal. When it comes to the Historic Preservation Board review, LMC Section 15-11-15 outlines the requirements for reconstruction. To approve reconstruction, the Board must find that the project complies with the following criteria:

- The Historic Structure is found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code;
- The Historic Structure cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair;
- The form, features, detailing, placement, orientation, and location of the Historic Structure will be accurately depicted by means of new construction based on as-built measured drawings, historical records, and/or current or historic photographs.

On April 10, 2025, the Chief Building Official visited the site and evaluated the structure. The Chief Building Official found that the structure was hazardous or dangerous. That report is included as an exhibit in the Meeting Materials Packet. As for the second criterion listed, the applicant submitted a report from a Licensed Structural Engineer, which is also included as an exhibit. It determines that the structure cannot be made safe or serviceable through repair, which Staff also found in their report. For the last criterion, the applicant proposes to reconstruct the structure based on the as-built documentation. A 3D scan of the building has been completed and as-built drawings have been created. In addition, photographs of the structure have been submitted as it currently exists.

LMC Section 15-11-15(B) requires the Historic Preservation Board to review reconstruction pursuant to 15-11-12 - Historic District or Historic Site, which requires the proposal to be reviewed for compliance with 15-13-2 - Regulations for Historic Districts and Historic Sites. As conditioned, Staff finds that the proposal complies with those.

Images were shared with the Board to illustrate the proposed plans for the doors. Planner Covey explained that the image on the left is what is existing and the image on the right is what is proposed. The portion highlighted in green is what the applicant proposes to retain. She shared images of the front façade, rear façade, and side façade. The red areas are proposed to be removed as part of this application while the blue areas are proposed to be added. Planner Covey next reviewed images to reflect the current and proposed windows. The windows shown in green are proposed to be retained in the updated structure. The windows shown in red are proposed to be removed and the ones shown in blue are proposed to be added. The applicant will be required to comply with the Historic District Guidelines related to materials as well as window size and ratio.

Planner Covey shared images of the porches located on the front façade. The applicant proposes to retain both of the porches. However, the railing on the front is not up to the current building standards. As a result, the applicant proposes to use the materials to create a railing that matches what exists and then use salvaged material where possible to comply with the current Building Code. There is a porch proposed to be removed on the rear façade. The applicant proposes to retain certain architectural elements on the front façade. The architectural elements highlighted in orange are proposed to be

retained. Those were added to the structure after 1978. The image on the left shows what the structure looked like when it was originally constructed. The light post in the front is proposed to be removed. Planner Covey explained that the Historic Preservation Board can add a Condition of Approval that requires the applicant to restore the form of the structure to its 1900s appearance prior to the architectural elements being added.

The addition is located on the secondary and tertiary facades and is elevated to comply with floodplain regulations. Planner Covey shared some example images of the addition. At this time, the proposed addition is larger than 50% of the footprint of the historic structure and would require a transitional element. Staff has recommended that the Board add a Condition of Approval to require the applicant to request a variance to the transitional element due to the unique constraints of the site, reduce the footprint of the addition so a transitional element is not required, or design a transitional element.

Planner Covey reviewed some of the decks the applicant proposes to remove and add to the rear façade. The applicant proposes to add a roof deck to the addition as well, but it would be minimally visible when viewed from the primary public right-of-way. The applicant will be required to provide a financial guarantee to ensure the historic structure is reconstructed and as many historic materials as possible are salvaged. The applicant has proposed to remove the material of the structure piece by piece and determine what can be used for reconstruction. The applicant must obtain Historic District Design Review (“HDDR”) approval, which will be processed through the Planning Department.

Some Conditions of Approval were highlighted. Planner Covey stated that the basement addition cannot raise the historic structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation above grade. Another condition states that the historic structure must be reassembled using the original materials that are safe and in serviceable condition. The applicant will need to submit an Industrial Hygienist Report for the materials proposed to be reused to determine that they comply with current safety standards and regulations. For the windows and doors, the applicant will need to submit a third-party report detailing the conditions, salvageability, and proposed repair or replacement. The applicant will need to avoid changing the position, proportions, or dimensions of historic door openings and not create additional openings or remove historic openings on the secondary façade that are visible from the primary public right-of-way. Other Conditions of Approval relate to the replacement of historic windows and the previously mentioned transitional element.

Staff recommends adding Condition of Approval #31 to the Final Action Letter to state that the north façade be panelized. The Historic Preservation Board could also condition that the structure be returned to its original form without the post-1970 architectural details. Staff recommends the Board consider approving the proposal based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter to deconstruct and reconstruct the Landmark Historic Structure at 176 Main Street and to match the existing conditions with a new foundation, basement, and addition on the north secondary and east tertiary facades.

The applicant representative, Bryan Markkanen explained that he is with Drift Studio and he is the architect representing the owner of the property. He referenced the 2-foot allowance to raise the building but explained that there is no proposal to raise the building. As a result, that condition will be met. When it comes to the addition design, due to the floodplain discovery, it is close to being done. However, there might be some slight changes made. Mr. Markkanen had a question about Conditions of Approval #13, #14, and #15. There are references to cribbing, excavation, and lifting the building, but there is no intention to do that. He clarified that there is no lift proposed. Mr. Markkanen next discussed the panelization on the north façade. It will be segmented when the addition goes on. That portion of the house will be compromised, so he asked if panelization makes sense if it will be cut in half anyway. He asked for some clarification.

Chair Stephens noted that there seems to be a lot asked of the Historic Preservation Board on this application. It seems there is a lot of historic material to be removed, but there are also some bigger issues to consider as well. He asked for clarification about what the Historic Preservation Board is being asked to consider. Director Ward explained that the Board will consider the deconstruction and reconstruction based on the criteria:

- The Historic Structure is found by the Chief Building Official to be hazardous or dangerous, pursuant to Section 116.1 of the International Building Code;
- The Historic Structure cannot be made safe and/or serviceable through repair;
- The form, features, detailing, placement, orientation, and location of the Historic Structure will be accurately depicted by means of new construction based on as-built measured drawings, historical records, and/or current or historical photos.

As the applicant mentioned, there are still details being worked through for the addition. Based on the Chief Building Official and Planning Director's site visit, the recommendation is panelization of the north façade, understanding that there will be modifications to accommodate the proposed addition on the secondary façade. The question is whether the Board finds that the three criteria for reconstruction are met for this project. If the Board would like additional information based on the site visit or more information for the Meeting Materials Packet, Staff would request direction about what would be useful to the Board. The item could then be continued to the Historic Preservation Board Meeting that is scheduled to take place in June. Based on the materials that have been provided to date, Staff feels the Board is able to consider reconstruction at the current meeting.

Board Member Gackle did not believe the Board was considering Material Deconstruction or the addition at this meeting, as that would come at a later time. Director Ward clarified that the addition would not come to the Historic Preservation Board. That would be a Staff level review through the HDDR process. She noted that the Board's consideration at the meeting is limited to the deconstruction and reconstruction of the historic structure.

Board Member Scott referenced Page 8 of the Meeting Materials Packet where the Landmark Historic Structure was referred to as a Reconstructed Landmark Historic Structure. He asked if this would still be considered significant if it was deconstructed

and reconstructed. Director Ward confirmed that it would retain the Landmark Historic Structure designation. Board Member Scott thanked her for the clarification.

Chair Stephens asked about the addition on the rear of the house. Mr. Markkanen clarified that there is no certainty about the date, but there is an assumption that it went in when the decorative elements were added. It has a different floor elevation inside.

Chair Stephens opened the public hearing.

Betsy Wallace gave her address as 158 Main Street. Ms. Wallace and her husband own a home that is three houses south of the Centennial. She expressed excitement about the work that is proposed because the building needs to be addressed. However, there is publicly accessible land right behind most of the homes and there is a desire to see that remain. She wants the publicly accessible land to stay public and asks that there not be fencing to prevent people from walking along that piece of property. Ms. Wallace mentioned the fires that happened in Los Angeles and the property that was lost. She would love there to be some consideration of fireproof materials so issues can be mitigated. As for the footprint of the home, she is not certain what is original to the site. Lastly, several homes along Main Street have no parking available except for a corner lot up the street. She does not know whether parking is planned for the subject property.

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

Board Member Puggy Holmgren noted that there is a requirement for fire suppression equipment in every commercial building. Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, reported that fire sprinklers and fire suppression systems are required in residential properties as well. Work has been done with the State to amend the code. It states that new residential properties are required to have fire sprinklers and fire suppression systems in place.

Board Member Lola Beatlebrox believes the Board is considering whether this can be reconstructed. This is a unique building and a unique situation. She pointed out that the building is extremely degraded. It is a shame that it was allowed to reach this condition. Given the current conditions, she is delighted that the proposal has been made. She feels the north side panelization is extremely important, as it needs to be protected. There have been a number of professionals who have looked at the building issues. It is clear that reconstruction is the best path forward. She expressed support for the reconstruction but is still concerned about the rear area and the garage on the left.

Board Member Gackle echoed the comments shared by Board Member Beatlebrox. He expressed frustration that the building was able to degrade enough to reach the state it is in now. Reconstruction is usually a last resort, but it is at that point. He agrees that reconstruction makes sense for this structure. Chair Stephens has some issues with what is proposed. He does not remember an occasion where there has been such a visible property, but so little information about whether it is possible to save the building as it is. There was a lot more information provided by the Star Hotel. If this is to be deconstructed

and reconstructed, he feels the Board needs to be thoughtful and explore every possibility. This might be the right direction, but he does not necessarily feel he has enough information to make a decision about the property. If the boards are removed one by one, he fears there will be a lot of material lost. As for the transitional element, that has not been considered. In addition, there are 1970s items that are proposed to be retained. It seems there are issues with the continuity of the design.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the Board normally works with applicants to decide what year the building will be brought back. She feels there should be a discussion about that. Board Member Gackle reported that Staff mentioned earlier that it is possible to require a transitional element or request a variance. Chair Stephens explained that the Board needs to first decide whether it is appropriate to move forward with the reconstruction. He does not feel a decision can be made about that without additional information. If the building is deconstructed and reconstructed, there could be confusion about what is old and new. The 1970s details remaining there will also create confusion.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that during the site visit, she asked about the professional who would look at the materials and determine what was useable. She feels there needs to be a report or some additional information provided. Board Member Noble understands the comments made by the other Board Members. She is not certain there is enough information about whether this building can be made safe and serviceable through repair. She would like some more information to make sure there is compliance with the safety and serviceability requirement that is outlined in LMC Section 15-11-15.

Board Member Scott is glad this structure is on the meeting agenda. He appreciates that something is proposed to be done with the structure. While he was unable to attend the site visit, it sounds like there was an exterior-only visit for safety reasons. Board Member Scott appreciates that Chair Stephens is interested in looking into all of the other options available. He would love some investigation into that. When he was reading the Meeting Materials Packet, he thought back to the Star Hotel. There was a site visit there and the Board knew that deconstruction and reconstruction was the only solution. In this case, he is relying on the Board Members who were involved in the site visit to the site.

Chair Stephens pointed out that if this moves ahead as proposed, there might not be a lot of material that can be used. If it ends up being replicated with mostly new siding, then it would be a disservice to the Historic District and anyone who is looking at the building and thinking that it is historic. He does not know that the Board has enough information.

Official Thacker noted that there has been some discussion about the structural integrity of the property and the letter from the engineer. They were able to go inside a couple of weeks ago and walk through. He pointed out that the property was condemned, as noted in the Staff Report. That condemnation is not just related to livability, but also to the structural integrity of the home. Walking into the home, either from the rear or front, there are temporary shoring walls that have been constructed and built. The roof is failing, the floors are failing, and it is possible to see the wear on the walls. The home also appears

to be shifting to the north and east side a little bit. All of these factors were taken into consideration. There is a desire to salvage and preserve as much as possible. However, the determination was made based on the state that this property is currently in.

Board Member Gackle noted that the Board was unable to go inside the building during the site visit to see the extent of the damage. Based on the fact that this building was condemned after a significant flood, and all of the other elements, it is clear that this building has structural issues. That being said, it would be worthwhile to have a study conducted and presented to the Historic Preservation Board so there is more certainty.

Chair Stephens does not doubt that this structure has suffered immensely from being neglected over the years, but this is a visible structure. He feels it is important to do thorough due diligence on what has been proposed. Board Member Gackle asked if a report could be requested from the Planning Department that highlights similarly deteriorated buildings. Chair Stephens is not certain that it is needed but wants to make sure other options have been considered for this structure. Mr. Markkanen reported that the building is not up to code for the Building Code structural standards. The whole building is moving and dropping in places. To try to salvage the structure would be prohibitively expensive. Salvaging this building in general is prohibitively expensive and is why it has been sitting on the market for such a long time. As for the garage on the side, it had to be moved upfront because of the floodplain issue. It follows the guidelines. The proposal is slightly over 50% of the square footage, but under 50%, there is no transitional element required. Work is being done to create a smaller addition so it will comply with the guidelines. The variance was mentioned in case it is ultimately pursued. There are a lot of restrictions on this lot, including the floodplain and sewer easement.

Mr. Markkanen shared information about the materials. He explained that they are now allowed to be a little bit different, which will better distinguish the old from the new. If all of the siding cannot be salvaged, a profile can be created to match closely. Mr. Markkanen discussed the 1970s additions. While it is possible to condition the approval so it returns back to the original 1900s design, he pointed out that everyone in town knows of the structure looking a certain way. As for panelization or trying to lift this building, he noted that this is bigger than most houses in Old Town. Based on his discussions with contractors, there are concerns about the dangers and expenses. There are certain limitations when it comes to trying to salvage something that is falling down.

Mr. Markkanen shared an image with the Historic Preservation Board to reflect the shoring. Some of the floors and walls are slanted. The Site Plan was shared. He noted that the pink lines indicate the sewer easement and the red lines indicate the setbacks.

Chair Stephens pointed out that every lot in Old Town has certain constraints. It sounds like the floodplain issue is a new issue to the applicant representative. While there is no design review done at the Historic Preservation Board level, it seems there are other design options to explore for the garage. His concern with the current application is whether or not all of the possibilities have been explored. He wonders if there is a design

that will meet the needs of the applicant and preserve the 1900s version of the building. Chair Stephens would like to see this item be continued to a future meeting.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked to review the three alternatives in the Staff Report:

- Approve the reconstruction;
- Deny the reconstruction and direct Staff to make findings for the denial; or
- Request additional information and continue the discussion to a date certain.

Board Member Beatlebrox agrees with the point made earlier that the community knows the building as it is currently, even though the building is not in good condition. Additional discussions were had about the 1900s version of the structure and the 1970s version. Board Member Gackle believed that the issue would need to be addressed after a decision is made about the reconstruction. The Board can then discuss whether there is a desire to mix the time periods or separate them. Director Ward asked to clarify what information the Board wants to see when this item comes back for consideration. Chair Stephens wants to see if there is a different design solution. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the Board is not looking at the addition but has been asked to look into reconstruction. Board Member Gackle pointed out that the reconstruction includes the 1970s addition. Board Member Beatlebrox does not believe there is a different solution to consider, given the information that has been shared by the Chief Building Official. Board Member Holmgren noted that the Centennial building is historic, but the 1970s additions are not.

Board Member Noble is excited that something is happening with this building. She referenced LMC Section 15-11-15 and the criteria that the structure cannot be made safe or serviceable through repair. She wants to make sure that the question can be answered. At this point, she does not feel there is enough information available to answer that.

Chair Stephens asked if it is possible to deny the reconstruction as it has been presented. The applicant would still have the opportunity to bring a new proposal to the Board. Board Member Scott asked what a new proposal would look like, which there was uncertainty about. Board Member Gackle believes there is a desire to see a proposal with the 1900s footprint and without the 1970s rear addition, dormers, and elements. Chair Stephens stated that the application could be denied and the applicant could bring forward a different proposal that is more of a restoration to the 1900s version of the structure. That is personally what he would like to see happen. Mr. Markkanen wanted to know if the Board is asking for a different design or if the uncertainty relates to the process of how the building would be deconstructed. Chair Stephens feels the way this application has been presented; the design goes against what the Board has been working towards with the transitional elements and restoration being consistent with a specific period in time.

Additional discussions were had about the proposal. Chair Stephens reiterated that if the application is denied, a different plan could be presented to the Board in the future. Board

Member Beatlebrox disagreed that the design would need to return to the 1900s version. Board Member Gackle reported that there are certain locations around town with Victorian elements, but based on what is seen here, the Victorian elements were not included by the 1940s. There needs to be specificity provided about what date the structure should be brought back to. For example, the 1900s or 1970s. Mr. Markkanen asked for additional clarification about what is desired by the Board. Chair Stephens feels there is an opportunity to come up with a better project that meets the historical guidelines.

Makenzie Kink Winder explained that she is representing her client in the purchase of the structure. She asked for some clarity to take back to her client, who will be closing at the end of this month. For instance, if there is something that needs to be seen from a public perspective. Chair Stephens clarified that there is not a desire to include the public in this process. This matter is between the Planning Department, the Historic Preservation Board, and the applicant. The public has an opportunity to respond to what is taking place. Ms. Kink Winder asked if it is possible to schedule another site visit for the Historic Preservation Board. The seller opted not to allow the Board to enter due to the deterioration and the liability if something happened. However, if that is a requirement, then it is possible to request that access. Chair Stephens noted that there can be work done with the Planning Department related to that. At this point, he is interested in a motion. Board Member Gackle wondered whether a motion to continue makes sense. Chair Stephens believes there needs to be specificity about what is brought back.

Director Ward reported that based on the Board discussion, there has been a request for information about restoration to the early 1900s footprint and whether that opens up opportunities for a lift or panelization. It was her understanding that the Structural Engineer would be in attendance at this meeting, so having the Structural Engineer at the next meeting will make it possible to address some of the questions. In addition, there can be additional documentation regarding the criteria for whether the structure can be made safe and serviceable. There is also a question about the ornamentation and the dormers. Director Ward recommended that the applicant complete the Industrial Hygienist Report prior to returning to the Board to provide additional clarity about the materials. There can be coordination with the applicant and this item can be continued.

MOTION: Board Member Gackle moved to CONTINUE the Reconstruction of 176 Main Street to the June 4, 2025, Historic Preservation Board, to obtain additional information, as summarized by Director Ward. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

B. 555 Deer Valley Drive – Historic District Grant Application – The Applicant Requests Historic District Grant Funding for Minor Repairs and Painting of the Exterior Facade of Two Significant Historic Sites Within the Line Condominium Development in the Residential Medium Density Zoning District. PL-25-06479.

Planning Project Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Historic District Grant Program application for 555 Deer Valley Drive. She shared an image and pointed out Unit #1 and Unit #10. These two Significant Historic Structures flank the non-historic condominium units fronting Deer Valley Drive. A historic photograph of Unit #1 was shared as well as a current conditions photograph. Manager Martin then shared a historic photograph of Unit #10 and a current conditions photograph. The grant request is for \$7,971, which is 50% of the total cost to complete the following work:

- Make minor repairs to the external siding, trim, band boards, porch, and railing in preparation for paint of two Historic Structures;
- Exterior paint and stain for two Historic Structures, including the following:
 - Repaint wood siding, stem wall, trim, soffit, windows, and sash;
 - Stain and clearcoat front door, paint basement door;
 - Repaint porch, stairs, and rail.

The funding for this grant would be sourced from the Citywide fund. To date, the Historic Preservation Board has awarded \$25,000 from that fund. The remaining balance is \$22,136. In the Staff Report, there is the criteria evaluation listed. The Staff recommendation is to review and score the Historic District Grant Program application, open a public hearing, and determine whether the grant should be awarded.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if the grant goes to the Homeowners Association (“HOA”) rather than the two condominium owners. Manager Martin reported that the HOA is the applicant and would be distributing the funds to get the work done. The HOA would also be covering the remaining balance. Board Member Beatlebrox scored this highly overall. She feels this is an excellent proposal and she supports the grant application. Board Member Holmgren agrees. Board Member Gackle had a similar criteria score to Board Member Beatlebrox. Board Member Scott believes this is what the grant program is for. He expressed his support for awarding the requested grant funds to the units.

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

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic District Grant Program Application for 555 Deer Valley Drive. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

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

C. 1455 Woodside Avenue – Relocation of Historic Structure – The Applicant Proposes Removing a 580-Square-Foot 1960s Rear Addition to Rehabilitate the 1904 Significant Historic Form, Restoring a Historic Porch, Relocating the 1904 Significant Historic Structure to the Southwest, and Creating Three Lots in the Recreation Commercial Zoning District. PL-23-05777

Director Ward reported that Planner III, Lillian Zollinger was unable to attend the Historic Preservation Board Meeting, so she will provide a high-level overview. Staff is asking for clarification on the motion, as there was an update in the lot width. She explained that there is no modification to the approval of the proposal, other than to clarify the lot widths to reflect the most recent information and ensure that the relocation complies with the side setback. The modified motion language is included in the Staff Report. Board Member Beatlebrox referenced the last page of the Meeting Materials Packet. It was clarified that the last page in the Meeting Materials Packet is what was presented last time, where it was stated that Board comments would be taken into consideration and the numbers would be clarified to create the new proposal. The second to last page shows some tapering. The building will not taper, but the image shows the buildable footprint.

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

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to RATIFY the Modified Draft Final Action Letter for 1455 Woodside Avenue, which is as follows:

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 107 feet, 5 inches in width, and 9,047 square feet.
4. The Significant Historic Structure is 1,065.44 square feet.

Material Deconstruction

5. 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.
6. 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.

7. 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.
8. 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

9. 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.
10. 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.”
11. The proposed plans comply with these sections because the Applicant proposes to reconstruct the front porch with appropriate materials for the time.

Relocation

1. The Significant Historic Structure is 22 feet, eight inches from the southeastern property line, and the Applicant proposes to Relocate it to maintain a three-foot south Side Setback and 12-foot, 6-inch Front Setback.
2. The Historic Preservation Board finds the proposed Relocation complies with LMC § 15-11-13, wherein:
 - a. For a Significant Site, all the following shall be met:
 - i. A licensed structural engineer has certified that the Historic Structure can successfully be relocated and the applicant has demonstrated

that a professional building mover will move the building and protect it while being stored; **Complies: The Applicant provided a Physical Conditions Report completed by Mission Structural, which noted "...the lift and relocation of this historic structure can be accomplished so long as exploratory work is carried out and structural modifications are implemented if and where required. In addition, structural stabilization methods will be required prior to relocation and code-compliant connections must be engineered to secure the existing structure to its new foundation."**

- ii. The proposed relocation will not have a detrimental effect on the structural soundness of the building or structure; **Complies: In the Physical Conditions report, Mission Structural noted that the following should be further analyzed and may be required prior to lifting to ensure the soundness of the Significant Historic Structure for lifting:**
 - 1. **Installing new structural hardware connections between existing boundary elements.**
 - 2. **Constructing temporary braces strategically placed within the boundary walls.**
 - 3. **Diaphragm reinforcement for the interior floor wood planks.**
- b. For Significant sites, at least one of the following shall be met:
 - i. The proposed relocation will abate demolition of the Historic Structure on the Site; or **Not met.**
 - ii. 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 **Not met.**
 - iii. 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:
 - 1. The historic context of the Historic Structure has been so radically altered that the proposed relocation will enhance the ability to interpret the historic character of the Historic Structure and the Historic District or its present setting; and **Complies: Since the Historic Structure is in the Recreation Commercial Zoning District, the setting of the structure is unique, and the setting of the area has been significantly modified. The original historic context of this area has been radically altered due to new construction allowed in the Recreation Commercial Zoning**

District that would typically be more restricted in a Historic Zoning District.

2. 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 **Not Applicable: As the Historic Structure is in the Recreation Commercial Zoning District, this criterion does not apply.**
3. The historical integrity and significance of the Historic Structure will not be diminished by relocation and/or reorientation; and **Complies: The Historic Structure will be preserved and not be diminished by its proposed relocation.**
4. The potential to preserve the Historic Structure will be enhanced by its relocation. **Complies: As conditioned, with the creation of a Lot for the Significant Historic Site that is 37 feet and 4 inches in width, and subdividing the remaining parcel to create a middle 26-foot, 8-inch-wide Lot and 43-foot 4 1/2-inch-wide Lot, the proposed relocation will enhance the site by creating a transition between adjacent new northern development and the three Historic Sites to the south.**

Conclusions of Law:

1. The removal of the 1960s addition to the Significant Historic Structure, as conditioned, complies with the requirements of LMC § 15-11-12.5 *Material Deconstruction*.
2. The restoration of the Significant Historic Structure porch, as conditioned, complies with the requirements of LMC § 15-13-2 *Regulations for Historic Residential Sites*.
3. The relocation of the Significant Historic Structure, as conditioned, complies with the requirements of the LMC § 15-11-13, *Relocation and/or Reorientation Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure*.

Conditions of Approval:

1. The Applicant must complete Historic District Design Review and Subdivision prior to submitting a Building Permit.
2. The Applicant shall submit a Subdivision Application and propose to the Planning Commission three Lots: the southern Historic Lot shall measure

37 feet, 4 inches in width, the middle Lot shall measure 26 feet, 8 inches in width, and the northern-most Lot shall measure 43 feet, 4 ½ inches in width.

3. The Relocation of the Significant Historic Structure is conditioned upon approval of a Subdivision as conditioned herein, and recordation of the Subdivision plat with Summit County.
4. The Applicant shall locate the driveway on the north side of the Historic Structure to create a buffer between the Historic Structure and new development.
5. The Setbacks on the Historic Lot shall be 12-foot, 6-inch Front Setback, three-foot Side Setbacks, and 12-foot, 6-inch Rear Setback.
6. 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.

Board Member Gackle seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed. Board Member Noble abstained from the vote.

8. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren 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 6:55 p.m.