



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
COUNCIL CHAMBERS  
445 MARSAC AVENUE  
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH  
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 4, 2026**

**BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Douglas Stephens – Chair, Puggy Holmgren, Katie Noble, Randy Scott, John Hutchings, Lola Beatlebrox, Dalton Gackle (attending virtually)

**EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:** Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Meredith Covey, Planner II; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II; Elissa Martin, Project Planning Manager

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**2. ROLL CALL**

All Board Members were present with the exception of Board Member Dalton Gackle.

**3. MINUTES APPROVAL**

**A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from January 7, 2026.**

**MOTION:** Board Member Scott moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from January 7, 2026. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

**4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES**

There were no Staff or Board communications and disclosures.

**5. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS**

There were no public communications.

**6. REGULAR AGENDA**

**A. 573 Main Street – Modification to Historic District Design Review – The Applicant Proposes to Modify the Historic District Design Review to Materially Deconstruct Portions of the Front and Secondary Façade to Restore Historic Windows and Façade in the Historic Commercial Business Zoning District. PL-25-06753.**

Planner II, Meredith Covey, presented the Staff Report and explained that 573 Main Street is a Landmark Historic Site on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory. The lot straddles two districts, the Historic Commercial Business (“HCB”) and Historic Residential – 2 Subzone A (“HR-2A”) Zoning Districts. The historic structure was constructed in 1913 with a wood addition that was constructed in the 1990s. In 2012, the applicant received a Historic District Design Review (“HDDR”) approval from the Planning Department. The applicant is now proposing to modify that HDDR. As part of the modification request, the applicant is proposing to restore three window openings on the historic structure. The first is on the north façade, which would require removing 15 square feet of material. Two are on the west façade, which would require removing 20 square feet of material in total. The Land Management Code (“LMC”) encourages the restoration of historic openings. Planner Covey explained that the new windows will need to match the historic windows on the structure.

The applicant is also proposing some changes to the primary façade. Planner Covey explained that the proposed changes are highlighted in the presentation materials. The proposal is to restore two windows on the front façade to picture windows with a three-part transom, as seen historically. There is also a proposal to restore steps leading to the door between the windows. The applicant is using photographic evidence to restore those features. The Planning Department’s Historic Consultant reviewed the window style and found that the proposed style is appropriate for the time the structure was constructed.

For the canopy on the north side of the structure, the applicant is proposing to remove the wood framing to increase the headroom. This does not increase the degree of non-compliance, which is compliant with the LMC regulations. On the north side, the applicant is proposing to convert a window into a door. This would require removing 15 square feet of historic material. New door openings on historic structures are permitted and appropriate only when not viewable from the primary public right-of-way. Planner Covey reported that this is on a secondary façade and is not visible from the primary public right-of-way. The applicant is proposing to match the historic dimensions and style with the new door.

Planner Covey reported that as conditioned, the proposal complies with the following:

- LMC 15-11-12.5 - Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction;
- LMC 15-13-3 - Regulations for Historic Commercial Structures; and
- LMC 15-9-6 - Regulations for Non-Complying Structures.

Some of the Conditions of Approval were highlighted. The applicant will be required to provide the City with a financial guarantee for the historic material proposed to be removed.

The applicant will also be required to obtain HDDR approval for the work that is proposed on the non-historic addition. There is a façade easement recorded against the property. As part of that façade easement, the applicant will need to coordinate with the Planning Department for express written permission for the work that is proposed on the front façade.

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board consider approving the request based on the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Conditions of Approval outlined in the Draft Final Action Letter. Planner Covey reported that there was public input received, which was forwarded to all of the Board Members. The applicant is present to answer questions.

It was noted that Board Member Gackle joined the meeting virtually at 5:05 p.m.

The applicant, Jonathan DeGray, reiterated that he was able to answer Board Member questions. There is agreement with the Staff Report, but he provided clarification about the canopy over what was the entrance. It is an addition and is not original to the building. The modifications to the canopy, while on the list, are not technically historic in nature. Chair Stephens asked for additional information about the canopy over the lower entrance. Planner Covey reported that the degree of non-compliance will not be increased.

Chair Stephens mentioned the comment that was emailed. He noted that the comment mentioned privacy concerns and asked if this is something the Historic Preservation Board can address. Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, reported that the LMC for historic districts does not prohibit rooftop decks, which is what the door would be accessing. The Municipal Code for noise will apply to the property, so the future use of the deck will need to comply with the noise ordinance. Board Member Puggy Holmgren asked about the future plans for the building. Mr. DeGray stated that it will be a 14-room boutique hotel. The rooftop deck would be accessed from one of the units and there will be plans brought back to the City.

Board Member Katie Noble asked for additional information about Figure 13. Mr. DeGray explained that all of the power into the building was originally housed there. Since then, this has been removed and moved to the back of the building. Board Member Lola Beatlebrox expressed support for the application and stated that this has been a long time coming. She commented that this is an incredible building and it will be wonderful to see it restored.

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

Board Member Randy Scott stated that he is pleased to see the project move forward. He likes that historic photographs are being referenced. There were no additional comments.

**MOTION:** Board Member Scott moved to APPROVE a Modification to a Historic District Design Review at 573 Main Street, based on the following:

**Procedural History:**

1. 573 Main Street was constructed in 1913 and is designated a Landmark Historic Site designated on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory.
2. The Structure straddles the Historic Commercial Business (HCB) and Historic Residential – 2 Subzone A (HR-2A) Zoning Districts.
3. The Landmark Historic Site is Lot 1 of the 573 Main Street Subdivision recorded with Summit County January 2, 2014.
4. In 2012 the Applicant submitted a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application to the Planning Department to expand the second and third level floor plan by adding approximately 125 square feet to the north of the Structure and approximately 400 square feet to the southwest corner of each floor. The proposal also involved a remodel of the rear façade to remove one door and two windows, remodel three windows, and change the pitch of the roof on the southwest corner.
  - a. On March 21, 2013, Planning Staff approved the Historic District Design Review (HDDR) (PL-12-01497).
5. On August 21, 2013, the Applicant submitted a request for a Modification to include a roof top deck on the southwest corner of the non-Historic portion of the existing building. The Applicant also proposed to extend the existing interior stair to gain access to the deck.
  - a. On September 30, 2013, Planning staff approved the request for Modification.
6. In November of 2013 the Building Department issued a Building for the exterior work Permit (BD-13-19143).
7. On March 23, 2017, the Building Department issued a Building Permit for interior tenant improvements (BD-16-22413).
8. The Applicant continues to work under these Building Permits.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. Pursuant to Land Management Code (LMC) § 15-13-3(B)(2)(f)(2) Historic window openings that have been altered or lost over time shall be restored. The Applicant's proposal to restore three window openings is compliant.
  - a. The Applicant proposes to restore one window opening on the north façade. The Applicant states that the previous window opening was

- filled in with non-Historic material and proposes to remove 15 square feet of material to restore the opening.
- b. The Applicant proposes to restore two west facing window openings on floor 2 and 3 of the Structure on the south façade. The Applicant states that the previous window openings were filled in with non-Historic material and proposes to remove 20 square feet of material to restore the openings.
  2. Pursuant to LMC § 15-13-3(B)(2)(d) the reestablishment of storefront windows to their Historic configuration is encouraged. The Applicant proposes restoring the fixed windows to those seen on the Structure historically.
  3. Pursuant to LMC § 15-13-3(B)(2)(d) missing elements shall be replaced in a manner that is consistent with the Historic Structure. The Applicant proposes to restore the steps to the southeast entrance based on photographic evidence of the absent features.
  4. Pursuant to LMC § 15-13-3(B)(2)(f) the removal of a Historic window opening is appropriate only on secondary façade when not visible from the primary public right of way. Additionally pursuant to LMC § 15-13-3(B)(2)(e) the creation of a new door opening is appropriate only on a secondary façade when not visible from the primary public right of way. The proposed converted door is not visible from the primary public right of way and is located on a second story. The proposed door is required to be compatible with the Historic Structure in design, materials, dimension and placement. The Applicant proposes to match the dimensions and form to the adjacent window opening.
  5. The Applicant does not propose to increase the height of the canopy which would result in the Historic windows being covered. LMC § 15-15-1 defines “Non-Complying Structure” as a Structure that “legally existed before its current zoning designation; and because of subsequent zoning changes, does not conform to the zoning regulation’s Setback, Height restrictions, or other regulations that govern the Structure.” The previous canopy Structure a Non-Complying Structure. Pursuant to LMC § 15-9-6, a Non-Complying Structure may be altered so long as it does not create any new non-compliance. The removing of the wooden framing to allow for additional headroom does not create any new non-compliance.
  6. Pursuant to LMC § 15-11-9 a Financial Guarantee is required prior to the issuance of a Building Permit. The Chief Building Official will determine the dollar amount for the necessary Financial Guarantee, and the Applicant will be required to record an encumbrance agreement, or other instrument in a form acceptable to the City Attorney, with the Summit County Recorder’s Office. When the work has been completed the Applicant will be responsible for contacting Park City Municipal Corporation to request a release of the encumbrance. Planning Staff will conduct an inspection to ensure compliance

with the Conditions of Approval, Historic Preservation Plan, and all other required codes, standards, and ordinances.

7. There is a façade easement recorded with Summit County (Entry No. 987046) protecting the primary façade of the Landmark Historic Structure. The easement requires that no changes be made to the façade of the Historic Structure, including the alteration, partial removal, construction, remodeling, or other physical or structural change without express written permission by a duly authorized representative of Park City Municipal.

**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 February 4, 2026, approval. 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. The Applicant shall coordinate with the Engineering Department for encroachments into the City Right-of-Way.
6. The replacement windows shall exactly match the historic window in size, dimensions, glazing pattern, depth, profile, and material.
7. The converted door shall be compatible with the Historic Structure in design, materials, dimension and placement.

8. The Applicant shall obtain HDDR approval from the Planning Department for the work proposed on the non-Historic addition.
9. The Applicant shall coordinate with the Planning Department for express written permission for work to the façade as required by the Façade Easement.
10. All work shall comply with LMC § 15-13-3 Regulations for Historic Commercial Structures.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

**B. 218 Sandridge Road – Historic District Grant Application – The Applicant Requests a \$24,900 Historic District Grant to Complete Framing Work on the Exterior Walls and Roof of 218 Sandridge Road, a Significant Historic Site. PL-25-06789.**

Planner II, Jacob Klopfenstein, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Historic District Grant Application for 218 Sandridge Road. He reported that there are two Historic District Grant Applications on the agenda, with the first at 218 Sandridge Road. It was noted that the applicant representative, Ben Akers, is also present at the meeting.

The applicant is requesting a grant of \$24,900 for framing of the exterior walls and roof repairs. Planner Klopfenstein reported that 218 Sandridge Road is a Significant Historic Site. This grant request is part of an ongoing restoration project at the site that includes a remodel, addition, and detached accessory building. The framing work on the exterior walls and the roof repairs are proposed to be completed in June 2026. Background information about the site was shared. On February 7, 2024, the Historic Preservation Board approved a Material Deconstruction request to remove siding and some roof material.

On January 6, 2025, the applicant entered into a Cash Deposit Agreement to ensure compliance with the approved Historic Preservation Plan. On December 3, 2025, the Historic Preservation Board approved a Modification request to remove the historic 1889 and 1907 roof forms and reconstruct the roofs. An exoskeleton was put in place to brace the walls during this work. On December 22, 2025, the applicant submitted the Historic District Grant Program application. Photographs of the current conditions were shared.

Planner Klopfenstein reported that the roof of the historic structure has been removed at this point and the applicant has implemented the exoskeleton framing system. Additional photographs were shared with the Historic Preservation Board. The Board can award up to \$127,136 in grants during Fiscal Year 2026 for emergency and competitive grants. 218 Sandridge Road is within the Main Street RDA. The fund for the Main Street RDA currently has \$30,000 available. If the Historic Preservation Board chooses to award \$24,900 to this property, there will be a remaining balance of \$5,100 for the remainder of the fiscal year.

Several Conditions of Approval from the Draft Final Action Letter were reviewed. There is a condition that states the work must comply with the Historic Preservation Plan for 218 Sandridge Road. Other conditions state that all previous Conditions of Approval will remain in effect and the grantee must maintain the architectural significance of the structure. Planner Klopfenstein reported that there are other Conditions of Approval included that are related to construction deadlines, proof of payment, lien requirements, and modifications.

In addition to the 218 Sandridge Road request, the Historic Preservation Board is evaluating an additional grant request for 525 Park Avenue. That grant request is \$24,500. 525 Park Avenue is also within the Main Street RDA. Planner Klopfenstein reiterated that there is \$30,000 available in that fund, so the Board will be unable to award both grants in full. If the Historic Preservation Board chooses not to award a grant to one of these projects, the applicant not awarded could apply in the next fiscal year, which will start in July 2026. The Staff recommendation is to review the Historic District Grant request for 218 Sandridge Road, open a public hearing, and determine whether a grant should be awarded.

Several options are available to the Historic Preservation Board, including the following:

- Award a \$24,900 Historic District Grant to 218 Sandridge Road and decline to award a Historic District Grant to 525 Park Avenue;
- Decline to award a Historic District Grant to 218 Sandridge Road and award a \$24,500 grant to 525 Park Avenue;
- Award a reduced grant amount to both 218 Sandridge Road and 525 Park Avenue, up to a total of \$30,000;
- Decline to award a Historic District Grant to either project;
- Request additional information and continue the discussion to a date certain or to a date uncertain.

Chair Stephens requested that the 525 Park Avenue grant information be presented before there is a discussion about potential grant amounts. There can be a Board Member discussion about the two proposals after all of the information has been provided by Staff.

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

After the 525 Park Avenue presentation, the Board voted on the grant amounts.

**MOTION:** Board Member Noble moved to APPROVE a Historic District Grant for 218 Sandridge Road for \$20,000 and directed Staff to modify the Final Action Letter to reflect the adjusted amount. The approval is based on the following:

**Background:**

1. On February 7, 2024, the Historic Preservation Board approved the Applicant's Material Deconstruction request to remove 48 square feet of 1940s-era siding on the southern façade of the building and to remove 64 square feet of the 1889 Roof Form.
  - a. As part of the approval, the Board determined that the removal of the 1889 roof material does not negatively impact the historic roof form and held its earlier finding that the removal of the 1941 addition's roof restores the roofline of the 1907 addition.
  - b. The Board included the November 1, 2023, decision to approve the applicant's Material Deconstruction of the 1941 roofline, which restored the 1907 roofline, in the February 7, 2024, Final Action Letter.
2. On January 6, 2025, the Applicant entered into a Cash Deposit Agreement in accordance with the City preservation policy outlined in LMC Section 15-11-9 to ensure protection of Historic materials throughout construction and compliance with the approved Historic Preservation Plan.
3. On December 3, 2025, the Historic Preservation Board approved the Applicant's Modification request for 218 Sandridge Road to remove the Historic 1889 and 1907 roof forms and reconstruct them with proper structuring and new standing seam-metal roofing, salvaging all possible salvageable Historic Materials.

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The City initiated the Historic District Grant Program (HDGP) in 1987 with the goal to financially incentivize the preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of Historic Structures and Sites to create a community that honors its past and encourages historic preservation.
2. Work eligible for a 50% matching grant through the HDGP includes, but is not limited to, repairing or replacing roofs and restoring Historic features.
3. The Applicant submitted a \$24,900 Historic District Grant request during Fiscal Year 2026, Quarter 2, for framing of the exterior walls, and roof of 218 Sandridge Road, a Significant Historic Site.
4. The Applicant proposes completing the framing work in June 2026.
5. 218 Sandridge Road is in the Main Street Redevelopment Area (RDA).
6. Funding for the Applicant's request will be sourced from the Main Street RDA grant fund, which has an initial balance of \$30,000.

- a. This is the first grant application for Fiscal Year 2026 that has been submitted for a Site within the Main Street RDA.
  - b. After the grant funds are dispersed to the Applicant for 218 Sandridge, the Main Street RDA fund will have a remaining balance of \$5,100.
7. HDGP recipients must agree to a five-year lien with the City that is recorded against the property.
- a. If the property is sold before the five-year period has passed, the Applicant is responsible for repaying the City a pro-rated amount of the awarded HDGP funds.
  - b. The Applicant for the HDGP request for 218 Sandridge was made aware of and acknowledged the lien requirements through the HDGP application process.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. The Applicant's request qualifies for a Historic District Grant award.

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. All work shall comply with the approved Historic Preservation Plan for 218 Sandridge.
2. All previous Conditions of Approval for 218 Sandridge remain in effect, including, but not limited to, Conditions of Approval from the Historic Preservation Board February 7, 2024 Final Action Letter and December 3, 2025 Final Action Letter.
3. The grantee shall maintain the architectural significance of the structure, retain and/or restore the historic character of the structure, preserve the structural integrity of the structure, and perform normal maintenance and repairs.
4. The grantee shall complete the work funded by the Historic District Grant within one year of approval of the grant application.
5. The Applicant shall submit a photograph of completed work to Planning Staff.
6. The grantee shall submit proof of payment to the Planning Department for disbursement of funds within 30 days of final inspection.
7. Prior to issuance of the grant, the grantee shall agree to and execute a five-year lien with the City in a form approved by the City Attorney's Office and record such lien with the Summit County Recorder's Office. Should the property be sold within the five-year period, the grantee is responsible for

repaying the City a pro-rated amount of the grant disbursement. If the property is sold within one year, 100% of the awarded funds shall be paid back to the City.

8. 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 prior to construction.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

**C. 525 Park Avenue – Historic District Grant Application – The Applicant Requests a \$24,500 Historic District Grant to Repair and Paint the Exterior Façade of the Landmark Historic Structure, known as St. Luke’s Episcopal Church. PL-25-06804.**

Project Planning Manager, Elissa Martin, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Historic District Grant Application for 525 Park Avenue. 525 Park Avenue is also known as St. Luke’s Episcopal Church. It is a Landmark Historic Site in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. The historic building was constructed circa 1901 during the Mature Mining Era. It is described on the Historic Sites Inventory Form as a small, one-story, frame, rectangular chapel in a simplified Gothic style, sided in painted horizontal shiplap.

According to the project description from the applicant, the external siding on the historic building is deteriorating due to years of exposure to high-altitude UV radiation and intense winter moisture cycles. This has caused the current paint coating to peel and crack. The grant funding would cover the cleaning of the external siding, the removal of surface contaminants, scraping and sanding of peeling areas, repair of substrate and replacement of rotted elements with in-kind materials, sealing of the windows, doors, and joints to protect against moisture, and the application of a high-adhesion primer and weather resistant paint to the building. The proposed external siding repair and paint qualify as eligible work items.

Manager Martin shared images of the structure that were submitted by the applicant. The funding request is \$24,500, which is 50% of the total estimated cost. The property is within the Main Street RDA and would be sourced from the \$30,000 Main Street RDA fund. This is the same funding source as the 218 Sandridge Road grant application. If the grant for 525 Park Avenue is awarded, the remaining balance of the Main Street RDA would be \$5,500. If the grant is not awarded, the applicant can apply again in Fiscal Year 2027.

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review and score the Historic District Grant Application for 525 Park Avenue, open a public hearing, and determine whether this grant should be awarded. Manager Martin shared the evaluation criteria with the Board.

Board Member Noble noted that the building is only 1,600 square feet. She asked about the cost to paint and repair the exterior. \$50,000 for a 1,600 square foot building seems

high. The applicant, Dan Moak, reported that he received a quote from a contractor, which was submitted with the application. It is possible that the full amount will be less than this as additional bids come in. Chair Stephens asked if the project work has started. Mr. Moak explained that there will be two or three more quotes obtained to ensure the best price is found for the work. The project needs to move forward because there is paint peeling off. For historic preservation, the historic wood on the property needs to be sealed. It was noted that the intention is to wait until the temperatures are warm enough to start the work.

Board Member Holmgren asked for a breakdown of the costs. Director Ward reported that the Meeting Materials Packet includes more detailed information. The application form has a page where there is a breakdown of the cost, but the level of detail provided can vary from applicant to applicant. Board Member Scott discussed the two grant applications that have been submitted. He likes the thoroughness of the 525 Park Avenue application. The application is complete and there is a clear outline of what the grant money will be used for. On the other hand, the 218 Sandridge Road application does not have as much detail.

Planner Klopfenstein shared the cost breakdown that was submitted by the applicant for the 218 Sandridge Road application. Mr. Moak shared additional comments about the 525 Park Avenue application. The goal of preserving the building is so it can be open every day. It is a volunteer run initiative and the building is owned by a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization. The goal of the project is to beautify it, since it is in a high traffic area, and to make it accessible for the people of Park City. Chair Stephens thanked him for the clarification.

Board Member Beatlebrox scored 525 Park Avenue at 17 points, which is a high score. It received a high score because of the important historic elements. Board Member John Hutchings explained that when he scored both applications and tried to break out the funding, it was \$20,000 to 525 Park Avenue and \$10,000 to 218 Sandridge Road. He scored the Park Avenue property high because of the landmark status and architectural features.

Board Member Scott reported that he gave 525 Park Avenue a score of 17 points. For 218 Sandridge Road, he did not feel that he had enough information to determine a score. Board Member Noble felt similar to Board Member Scott. She did not feel there was as much clarity with the 218 Sandridge Road application compared to the 525 Park Avenue application. She gave the 525 Park Avenue property a score of 16 points. Board Member Noble explained that her background includes the renovation of historic houses. Her concern is that the costs associated with the 525 Park Avenue project seem to be high. Her preference would be to award some money to that project now. There could be another application submitted in the future when there is a desire to do work on the inside.

Board Member Holmgren stated that 525 Park Avenue is an important part of Park City. When she saw that this was submitted as a grant application, she was excited, because the work will be beneficial. Board Member Gackle scored both properties similarly. 218 Sandridge Road has come before the Board before, so there might have been an assumption that the Board was familiar with the project. Both projects are deserving of funding, so it makes sense for the Historic Preservation Board to discuss possible amounts.

Chair Stephens asked how much the Main Street RDA started with at the beginning of the fiscal year. Manager Martin reported that it started with \$30,000. These are the first two applications in this fiscal year for the Main Street RDA. Chair Stephens believed both applications were noteworthy for different reasons. 218 Sandridge Road is focused on restoration and there is an extensive restoration plan in place. There might not have been as much detail included in the application, but this is something the Board has discussed before. It will be a visible piece of residential history. 218 Sandridge Road is far into the process where 525 Park Avenue is just starting the process. It is important for the Board to consider how to assist both applicants. It was noted that the 525 Park Avenue applicant could apply for additional funding at the start of the next fiscal year. Chair Stephens pointed out that it is also possible to award some funding to that project in the current fiscal year.

Chair Stephens suggested splitting the funding amount, with slightly more for the 218 Sandridge Road project, since the 525 Park Avenue project is not as far along in the process. Director Ward reported that the Historic Preservation Board could direct Staff to modify the Draft Final Action Letter for the awarded amount. If the applicants come forward with revised plans, those would be evaluated under a new application. Chair Stephens suggested \$24,000 for the 218 Sandridge Road application and \$6,000 for 525 Park Avenue, with it being made clear that the Board would like to see an application return for Park Avenue.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the amounts should be more even. Board Member Noble noted that if both applicants are unable to obtain the necessary funding at the current time, both could submit grant applications in the next fiscal year as well. These are both worthwhile projects, so it is a difficult decision to make. She expressed support for \$20,000 for the 218 Sandridge Road application and \$10,000 for the 525 Park Avenue application.

Board Member Hutchings asked if there needs to be clarification about what the \$10,000 would be used for, since it would only cover a portion of what has been submitted for. Director Ward explained that the way the Draft Final Action Letter is written, it would be for the same scope of work, but a reduced award amount would be granted. It is possible for the applicant to submit another application in the next fiscal year for the same project. There would need to be a breakdown submitted that shows how the funds have been used.

Board Member Gackle believed that if the awarded amounts were split fairly evenly, both projects would likely submit applications in the next fiscal year as well. That is not necessarily a bad thing, since these are the first applications the Historic Preservation Board has received this fiscal year for the Main Street RDA funds. Board Member Scott stated that it makes sense to focus on what is currently before the Historic Preservation Board.

Board Member Gackle agreed with earlier comments from Chair Stephens. The process has already started for 218 Sandridge Road, which means the funds will be used almost immediately. As a result, an even split of the grant funding does not necessarily make sense.

Board Member Beatlebrox reported that one applicant is a non-profit and the other is an individual. Board Member Gackle pointed out that both are historic structures in need of preservation. Board Member Hutchings agreed with the comment made by Board Member

Soctt about focusing on what is currently before the Historic Preservation Board. Based on his score, the Park Avenue application has more historic value. As a result, he would award more grant funding to that project. Board Member Holmgren liked the amounts proposed by Board Member Noble earlier in the meeting, which were \$20,000 and \$10,000.

Chair Stephens reiterated that the 218 Sandridge Road project is already in process. It is a substantial historic restoration of a single-family residence. He would support \$20,000 being awarded to that project and \$10,000 to the 525 Park Avenue project. He would hope that the Park Avenue project would return to the Historic Preservation Board in the future.

Additional discussions were had about the two grant applications and the amount to award. Chair Stephens pointed out that the Board has asked a lot of the 218 Sandridge Road project already. Board Member Gackle noted that the Sandridge home is from the 1800s and work might need to be done more immediately. The church was built slightly after and could withstand a slight delay in the funding. He is leaning toward the \$20,000 and \$10,000 split.

Board Member Noble asked about funds from a different location that might not be used by the end of the fiscal year. She wanted to know if there was a way to move those to another fund, which was denied. Board Member Noble wondered if it would be possible to increase the Main Street RDA amount next year. Director Ward reported that the City Council will start the Fiscal Year 2027 budget discussions shortly. If the Historic Preservation Board feels there should be a request made to increase the grant funds, that is something that can be communicated. The Board continued to discuss the current grant applications.

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

**MOTION:** Board Member Noble moved to APPROVE a Historic District Grant for 525 Park Avenue for \$10,000, and directed Staff to modify the Final Action Letter to reflect the adjusted amount. The approval is based on the following:

**Findings of Fact:**

1. The City initiated the Historic District Grant Program (HDGP) in 1987 with the goal to financially incentivize the preservation, rehabilitation, restoration, and reconstruction of Historic Structures and Sites to create a community that honors its past and encourages historic preservation.
2. Work eligible for a 50% matching grant through the HDGP includes, but is not limited to restoring Historic features and painting exterior.
3. The Applicant submitted a Historic District Grant application during Fiscal Year 2026, Quarter 2, for \$24,500 to repair and paint the external façade of the Historic Structure at 525 Park Avenue, known as St. Luke's Episcopal Church, a Landmark Historic Site in the Historic Residential-1 (HR-1) Zoning District.

4. The Applicant proposes completing the work in the summer of 2026.
5. 525 Park Avenue is in the Main Street Redevelopment Area (RDA).
6. Funding for the Applicant's request will be sourced from the Main Street RDA grant fund, which has an initial balance of \$30,000.
  - a. This is one of two grant applications submitted for Q2 Fiscal Year 2026 for a Site within the Main Street RDA.
  - b. If the funding request for \$24,500 for 525 Park Ave is awarded it would result in a remaining balance of \$5,500 for the Main Street RDA.
7. HDGP recipients must agree to a five-year lien with the City that is recorded against the property.
  - a. If the property is sold before the five-year period has passed, the Applicant is responsible for repaying the City a pro-rated amount of the awarded HDGP funds.
  - b. The Applicant for the HDGP request for 525 Park Avenue was made aware of and acknowledged the lien requirements through the HDGP application process.

**Conclusions of Law:**

1. The Historic Preservation Board determined the Applicant's funding request for 525 Park Avenue qualifies for a Historic District Grant award on February 4, 2026.

**Conditions of Approval:**

1. The grantee shall maintain the architectural significance of the structure, retain and/or restore the historic character of the structure, preserve the structural integrity of the structure, and perform normal maintenance and repairs.
2. The grantee shall complete the work funded by the Historic District Grant within one year of approval of the grant application.
3. The Applicant shall submit a photograph of completed work to Planning Staff.
4. The grantee shall submit proof of payment to the Planning Department for disbursement of funds within 30 days of completion of the work.
5. Prior to issuance of the grant, the grantee shall agree to and execute a five-year lien with the City in a form approved by the City Attorney's Office and record such lien with the Summit County Recorder's Office. Should the property be sold within the five-year period, the grantee is responsible for

repaying the City a pro-rated amount of the grant disbursement. If the property is sold within one year, 100% of the awarded funds shall be paid back to the City.

6. 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 prior to construction.

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

- D. **732 Crescent Road – Modification of Historic District Design review – The Applicant Proposes to Panelize the Landmark Historic Structure to Construct a Basement and Rear Addition in the HR-1 Zoning District. PL-26-06813.**

It was noted that the application was withdrawn.

9. **ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** Board Member Holmgren moved to ADJOURN the Historic Preservation Board Meeting. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 5:53 p.m.

## Meredith Covey

---

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 4, 2026 12:23 PM  
**To:** Meredith Covey  
**Cc:** Len Braudis  
**Subject:** Re: [External] 573 Main Street

Warning: Replies to this message will go to [REDACTED] If you are unsure this is correct please contact the helpdesk.

Meredith,

Thank you for the below information. Unfortunately we are not able to attend the meeting tonight as we have a conflict with the timing.

I would like to submit to the board our serious concerns with noise and privacy as it relates to a window being replaced by door for access to a rooftop. This is on the north facade. As the board will see from the attached photo, this roof looks directly at our yard and home and there is absolutely no screening from a noise perspective let alone the ability for some sense of privacy. With all the historic regulation that goes on in Old Town I am perplexed how this can be passed without proper efforts of remediation for other property owners rights.

Elizabeth Braudis.

2:11

X

