



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD MEETING
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
COUNCIL CHAMBERS
445 MARSAC AVENUE
PARK CITY, SUMMIT COUNTY, UTAH
MINUTES OF APRIL 1, 2026**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox, John Hutchings, Katie Noble, Puggy Holmgren

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Rebecca Ward, Planning Director; Elissa Martin, Project Planning Manager; Jacob Klopfenstein, Planner II; Lillian Zollinger, Planner III; Dave Thacker, Chief Building Official; Mark Harrington, Senior City Attorney

1. CALL TO ORDER

In the absence of Chair Douglas Stephens, Board Member Lola Beatlebrox called the Historic Preservation Board Meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m. Planning Director, Rebecca Ward, asked Board Members to vote on a Chair Pro Tem for the meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved that Lola Beatlebrox serve as Chair Pro Tem for the duration of the meeting. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

2. ROLL CALL

A roll call was conducted and the Board Members present were identified. Chair Stephens, Board Member Dalton Gackle, and Board Member Randy Scott were all absent.

3. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from March 4, 2026.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from March 4, 2026. Board Member Noble seconded the motion.

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

4. STAFF AND BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

A. External Siding Materials in Historic Districts – Staff Update on the Materials Evaluation Framework Being Developed by the Materials Advisory Committee.

Project Planning Manager, Elissa Martin, reported that the Historic Preservation Board conducted a Work Session in March 2026 to review progress the Materials Advisory Committee had made. During the Work Session, Staff shared information about a Materials Evaluation Framework, which establishes performance-based metrics and minimum thresholds materials must meet in order to be added to the materials list. The Historic Preservation Board provided positive feedback and encouraged the Committee to continue development of the performance-based framework. The Committee has met once since the last Historic Preservation Board discussion, but the framework has not been adopted.

Additional time is needed to reach consensus on some of the performance measures, metrics, and minimum thresholds. The Committee has requested that agenda item 6A be continued to a date uncertain to allow for additional discussion. Planner Martin explained that it is anticipated the framework will be brought back to the Board for adoption in June.

5. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no public communications.

6. CONTINUATIONS

A. External Siding Materials in Historic Districts – The Historic Preservation Board will Review and Consider Adopting the Materials and Finishes for Additions to Historic Structures and New Residential infill in the Historic Districts.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox noted that the External Siding Materials in Historic Districts item was discussed during Staff Communications. A request has been made for continuation.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the External Siding Materials in Historic Districts item to a date uncertain. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

7. WORK SESSION

A. Historic District Grant Program – The Historic Preservation Board will Consider Potential Improvements to the Historic District Grant Program.

Planner II, Jacob Klopfenstein, presented the Staff Report and explained that this Work Session item relates to the Historic District Grant Program. During the previous Work Session, Board Members expressed support to increase the amount of funding available for the Historic District Grant Program. There was also support to potentially expand the eligibility of the program to include Ski Era Resources, such as A-Frames. In addition, there was a discussion about updates to the eligible work and evaluation criteria.

Staff researched similar historic preservation grants in other jurisdictions. There are not a lot of similarities to the other programs. Most historic preservation grant programs are reserved for non-profit organizations rather than private property owners. However, there were programs in Colorado, Oregon, and Washington that were somewhat similar to the Historic District Grant Program. Some of the goals of those programs include:

- Rehabilitating historic elements and restoring building integrity of historic buildings;
- Replacing non-historic elements with historic materials;
- Funding projects that increase the historic value of the structure.

Planner Klopfenstein reported that additional details about these programs are included in the Staff Report. He next discussed the eligible work for the Historic District Grant Program. Based on some of the feedback received at the last Work Session and the research done in other jurisdictions, Staff recommends adding the following to the list of eligible work:

- Landscaping in front yards (not associated with non-historic rear additions);
- Foundation work (not associated with garage additions);
- Environmental work (lead/asbestos abatement, radon mitigation, etc.)

Planner Klopfenstein asked if there are any other items that should be added. Chair Pro Tem Beatiebrox suggested that the Board return to this question after the presentation. Manager Martin reported that there was a discussion about the application form during the last Work Session. There was Historic Preservation Board consensus on an update. Currently, the application form requires certain information to be included, such as:

- Project description;
- Cost estimate;
- Breakdown of proposed work and cost estimates;
- Proposed project timeline;

- Historic District Design Review (“HDDR”) approval letter;
- Drawings of the proposed project (if applicable);
- Color photographs of the existing site conditions.

Based on Board Member feedback, the Staff recommendation is to update the Historic District Grant Program form. The additional requirements include the following:

- At least one professional bid for projects over \$10,000;
- Narrative explaining how the proposed work will meet/address each of the Historic District Grant Program evaluation criteria;
- Information on the intended use. (Example: if the property will be owner-occupied, a long-term rental, or a nightly rental).

Manager Martin asked if there are other items that should be required on the application form. As for the evaluation criteria, Staff recommends updating Criteria #2 and Criteria #4:

- Proposed improvements to the site will positively impact the vitality of the historic context of the neighborhood;
- The historic features and elements of the structure and/or site will be enhanced by the proposed work.

Manager Martin asked if there are other criteria that should be revised as well. During the next Work Session, there is a desire to discuss Ski Era Resources and additional outreach methods to increase program awareness. It is also possible to discuss the lien requirements and determine whether that is prohibitive. The cost share structure can also be evaluated at a future Work Session. Board Members were asked to address the current items.

The Historic Preservation Board first discussed the application form. Board Member Puggy Holmgren noted that some people have submitted lined sheets of paper with handwritten information. She asked if there could be requirements related to the format and presentation. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox felt there should be specific line items included when a grant application is submitted. She asked that bids for projects over \$10,000 also include an itemized list. Board Member Katie Noble expressed support for two bids.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox mentioned the suggestion for a “narrative explaining how the proposed work will meet/address each of the Historic District Grant Program evaluation criteria.” She feels there needs to be an overhaul done of the evaluation criteria and scoring method to ensure the criteria matches the applications received. Manager Martin agreed that the eligible work items need to tie back to the evaluation criteria, which then needs to tie back to the application form. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox asked why the information about intended use is considered important and why the lien is important. She feels the focus should be on improving what is historic. Board Member Noble

disagreed with the comment about the lien. She feels it is necessary for that to be in place for at least three years. However, there could be a lien requirement for projects over \$10,000 or projects that meet a certain financial threshold. Board Member Noble agreed with the comments about the use.

Board Member Holmgren does not have an issue with the lien. Many years ago, she needed a grant after the roof on her home slid off. She had a five-year lien in place at that time, which did not bother her. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox pointed out that situations can change, and people might need to sell their houses for many different reasons. She does not know that a lien needs to be in place for five years. Board Member Holmgren was open to adjusting the amount of time. Planner Klopfenstein reported that there can be additional research conducted to determine where the five-year timeline originally came from. As for the reason, the intended use was suggested, and previous Board Members considered that as part of their evaluation. It sounds like the intended use is not as important as preservation. Board Member John Hutchings believes the use is important. He does not like the idea of taxpayer money being used to improve an asset that someone will then turn around and profit off of.

Board Member Hutchings suggested that if someone has a nightly rental business license, the property will not qualify for the Historic District Grant Program. Additional discussions were had about the intended use. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox does not see a reason to ask about the use. Planner Klopfenstein stated that Staff can look into this further. He reported that the lien requirement will be considered as part of a future Work Session.

Planner Klopfenstein asked about the \$10,000 threshold for professional bids. He wanted to know if that is an appropriate threshold. Board Member Hutchings agreed with the earlier comment from Board Member Noble that two bids should be required. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox also liked the idea of requesting that there be two bids for projects over \$10,000.

The Historic Preservation Board next discussed eligible work and items that could be added to the list. Planner Klopfenstein reminded Board Members that Staff suggested adding landscaping in front yards, foundation work, and environmental work. Board Member Noble expressed concerns about the landscaping suggestion. She likes the idea of beautifying properties, but does not believe that it necessarily relates to historic work. As for radon mitigation, she does not think that is something the grant program should be focused on. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox and Board Member Hutchings agreed. Board Member Holmgren stated that if the landscaping is included, there would need to be some clear guidelines.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox does not feel that landscaping is within the purview of the Historic Preservation Board. She believes the focus of the grant program should be the actual built environment. Planner Klopfenstein noted that landscaping can be a broad category. There was a recent request for a grant that involved a retaining wall. He

explained that there could be an argument made that a retaining wall is associated with landscaping. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox reported that it was a historic retaining wall in that example. Manager Martin reported that the retaining wall fell under a different category, so it would be possible to expand that category slightly so there is clarity that historic retaining walls are included.

Planner Klopfenstein summarized the Board Member comments. There does not appear to be support for the inclusion of landscaping in the eligible work. In addition, there is no support to include radon mitigation systems, because that impacts the physical appearance of the historic structure. There was Board Member support to include foundation work.

The evaluation criteria was considered. Planner Klopfenstein believed the Board would like a more substantial review of the evaluation criteria rather than only the two mentioned. The current evaluation criteria was shared with the Board. Board Member Hutchings acknowledged that there could be additional specificity included, but noted that having broader criteria can be beneficial as well. Board Member Noble agreed with those comments. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox explained that she has concerns about the following:

- Priority is given to restoration and treatment of historic materials, rather than replacing historic materials and features in-kind.

Manager Martin noted that the language could be revised slightly to consider whether a project is restoring existing materials or replacing lost materials. There could potentially be points provided if something is improving the overall safety of the structure. Planner Klopfenstein reported that it is possible to draw from some of the criteria seen in the other jurisdictions. He explained that some of those involved were protecting the integrity of the structure or increasing the value of the structure. It is also possible to explore adding to the last criterion. There could be something added to state: "If restoring the element is not possible, please explain why restoration cannot be done, and replacement is necessary." Board Members further discussed the evaluation criteria and historic materials. Board Member Hutchings suggested that there be language criteria specifically related to replacement.

Planner Klopfenstein reviewed additional discussion topics for future Work Sessions:

- Inclusion of Ski Era Resources, such as A-Frames;
- Additional outreach to increase awareness of the grant program;
- Revising lien requirements;
- Evaluating cost share structure.

Board Member Noble would like to understand how many houses in the Historic District would be included if the Ski Era Resources were added. She also asked for some examples of what those houses look like in the next Meeting Materials Packet. Board

Member Holmgren asked if the A-Frames are considered historic since those are over 50 years old. Director Ward clarified that those are not considered. Expanding the Historic District Grant Program to include some non-designated sites would not automatically designate them as historic. She added that the 50-year timeframe does not automatically designate a site.

Planner Klopfenstein thanked the Board for providing feedback on the Historic District Grant Program. There will be more discussions at the next Historic Preservation Board Meeting.

8. REGULAR AGENDA

A. 615 Woodside Avenue – Modification to Material Deconstruction – The Applicant Requests Panelization of the Significant Historic Structure’s Roof, a Partial Panelization of the Northeastern Portion of the Structure, Removal and Replacement of the Front Porch, and Removal and Replacement of a Structural Beam and Shed Roof Beneath the Sunroom to Construct the Approved Basement Addition and Garage. PL-26-06841.

Planner III, Lillian Zollinger, presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Modification to Material Deconstruction at 615 Woodside Avenue. She reported that 615 Woodside Avenue is a Significant Historic Structure with a non-historic addition that was built prior to 1889. It is an existing non-complying structure in the Historic Residential – 1 Zoning District. In 2024, the Historic Preservation Board approved lifting the Historic Structure to construct a basement. Since then, the applicant has been issued a Building Permit and has started work on the Historic Structure. However, there were some concerns about stability and the ability to lift the entire structure. Based on that, the applicant submitted a Structural Engineer Report, which is attached as an exhibit to the Staff Report.

Based on the recommendations in the report, the applicant is requesting a modification for:

- Full roof disassembly and reassembly;
- Partial panelization of the Historic Structure;
- Material Deconstruction of the sunroom shed roof, supporting beam, and porch.

Planner Zollinger shared an image that was submitted by the applicant. The red color indicates areas where there are no proposed changes. She explained that the non-historic addition is shown in red toward the rear. The applicant is still proposing to lift the blue portion shown, but the proposal is to remove and reassemble the green section. The proposal is also to remove and reassemble the wraparound porch, remove the shed roof, and a structural beam. Planner Zollinger reviewed several proposed Conditions of Approval.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox commented that the proposal makes sense. There is some familiarity with this property, and a lot of previous Board Member concerns have been addressed. The applicant representative, Cole Knight, explained that work has been done to follow the spirit of the code. He feels that what is proposed is the best solution to preserve the historic structure and ensure the job site is safe and manageable. Board Member Noble believed the shed roof in the front will be removed and not replaced. Mr. Knight reported that it will be removed, and whatever materials are serviceable will be salvaged. It will be put back on the building to formally represent the current iteration. The section highlighted in orange has moisture damage and is tied structurally to the beam that sits beneath it. The beam itself is warping and buckling and cannot be salvaged in order to function structurally.

Chief Building Official, Dave Thacker, reported that there have been on-site visits and work done with the contractor, designer, and engineer. There is a phenomenal job being done attempting to preserve all that is possible. The project is moving in the right direction.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Hutchings moved to APPROVE the Modification to Material Deconstruction at 615 Woodside Avenue, according to the following:

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 Applicant proposes to disassemble and reassemble the historic roof structure, disassemble and reassemble the northeastern portion of the structure, remove and replace the wrap-around porch, and remove and replace the shed roof and the support beam of the sunroom.
4. On February 15, 2026, Courtney Fleming from Mission Structural completed a Structural Approach for Lifting and Preservation Report that evaluated the Historic Structure.
5. The Applicant has shown that no windows on the Historic Structure are historic or wood, therefore aluminum-clad wood windows are allowed to be installed on the Historic Structure pursuant to LMC § 15-13-2(B)(2)(d).

6. The HPB reviews panelization requests for compliance with LMC § 15-11-14, Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure, and LMC § 15-13-4(B)(1), Disassembly & Reassembly of All or Part of a Historic Structure.
 - a. LMC § 15-11-14(A)(1) requires that a licensed structural engineer has certified that the Historic Structure cannot be reasonably moved intact.
 - i. The Applicant provided an engineer's report from Mission Structural that stated, "Due to the combined mass, it is not feasible to lift both historic structures simultaneously."
 - b. LMC § 15-11-14(A)(2) requires the Historic Preservation Board to determine, with input from the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official, that unique conditions and the quality of the Historic Preservation Plan warrant the proposed disassembly and reassembly.
 - i. On March 11, 2026, the Planning Director and Chief Building Official determined that unique conditions and the quality of the Historic Preservation Plan warrant the proposed disassembly and reassembly.
 - c. LMC § 15-13-4(B)(1) requires the Applicant thoroughly document the disassembly of the Historic Structure.
7. The HPB reviews Material Deconstruction requests for compliance with LMC § 15-11-12.5 and LMC § 15-13-2.
 - a. The proposed deconstruction of the deck and roof requires compliance with LMC § 15-13-3, wherein, the existing porch material and details shall be preserved. Where historic materials cannot be kept or repaired, replacement elements shall match the historic elements exactly.
8. Pursuant to LMC § 15-11-9, a Financial Guarantee is required prior to the issuance of a Building Permit.
 - a. On October 6, 2025, the Applicant recorded a Financial Guarantee and on October 14, 2025, a Building Permit was issued.

Conclusions of Law:

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11-9, *Preservation Policy*.
2. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11.12-5, *Historic Preservation Board Review for Material Deconstruction*.

3. The proposal, as conditioned, complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to LMC § 15-11-14, *Disassembly And Reassembly Of A Historic Building Or Historic Structure*.

Conditions of Approval:

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the modified Historic Preservation Board approval dated April 1, 2026, for the partial Panelization of the northeastern side, Panelization of the roof, and Material Deconstruction of 615 Woodside Avenue. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved plans that have not been approved in advance by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop-work order.
2. The applicant is responsible for notifying the Planning and Building Departments prior to making any changes to approved plans.
3. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved scope of work shall be submitted in writing for review and approval/denial in accordance with the applicable standards by the Planning Director or their Designee prior to construction.
4. The basement addition shall not raise or lower the Significant Historic Structure more than two feet from its original floor elevation.
5. The Historic Site shall be returned to original grade following the construction of a foundation. When the original grade cannot be achieved, generally no more than six inches of the new foundation shall be visible above Final Grade on the primary and secondary facades.
6. This approval requires stabilization and protection for the lifting of the historic structure. The Applicant under this approval is required to stabilize the structure for the lift. Any material deconstruction beyond the scope of this final action letter is prohibited without obtaining Chief Building Official, Planning Director, and Historic Preservation Board Review.
7. 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.
8. The Significant Historic Structure must be reassembled using the original materials that are found to be safe and/or in serviceable condition in combination with new materials.

9. The Significant Historic Structure shall be reassembled in its original form, location, placement, and orientation.
10. The disassembly of the Historic Structure shall be documented and comply with LMC § 15-13-4(B)(1) requirements

Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

B. 525 Park Avenue – Historic District Grant Application Modification – The Applicant Requests an Amendment to the Historic District Grant Awarded on February 4, 2026, to Change the Scope of Work from Exterior Paint and Siding Repair to Replacing Mechanical Equipment and Historic Windows. PL-26-06804.

Manager Martin presented the Staff Report and explained that this is a Historic District Grant Application Modification request for 525 Park Avenue. She reported that 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, and the structure was built circa 1901, within the Mature Mining Era. The small, one-story, frame, rectangular chapel in a simplified Gothic style is sided in painted horizontal shiplap. Background information was shared with the Board.

On February 4, 2026, the Historic Preservation Board awarded a \$10,000 grant for the repair and painting of the exterior siding. The original funding request was \$24,500, which was approximately 50% of the estimated total cost for the siding repair and paint. The Board awarded substantially less than the grant funding request due to a second grant request being considered on the same evening. This site was competing for the same Main Street RDA funds, which had a balance of \$30,000 at the time. The applicant explained in the narrative that the funding gap has made the painting project costs prohibitive at this time.

The applicant is requesting to amend the scope of work to cover other needed restoration work and upgrades. If the Historic Preservation Board approves the amended scope of work, the applicant intends to return to the Board with a second grant request in Fiscal Year 2027 to support the exterior painting work. The amended scope of work includes replacing the original stained-glass windows and upgrading outdated mechanical systems. Manager Martin shared images of the stained glass. The proposal is to replace the stained glass in the front façade window, as well as the original west façade-stained glass behind the altar. The window restoration work would fall under the following eligible work items:

- Restoring Historic Features; and
- Replacing Historic Windows.

The second part of the scope of work relates to mechanical systems. Manager Martin reported that the furnace is from 1987. Additionally, the water heater from 2006 is beyond the service life of 15 years. The total estimated cost of the amended scope of work is \$22,458. The funding request is \$10,000. Manager Martin explained that the request is to apply the February 4, 2026, grant award of \$10,000 to the amended scope of work.

Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board review the amended scope of work for the Historic District Grant Program award at 525 Park Avenue and open a public hearing. The Board is asked to determine whether the amended scope of work is eligible for the grant award and if the February 4, 2026, grant award should be applied to the amended scope.

There was discussion about the historic stained glass. The applicant, Dan Moak, reported that the previous owner removed the stained glass prior to selling the building. The historic chapel has lost a lot of character without those pieces of stained glass, so the proposal is to replace them. Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox gave this a score of 15 and expressed support for the work that has been proposed. Other Board Members also expressed their support.

Board Member Hutchings asked if this is the appropriate process. He wondered whether there should be a new Historic District Grant Program request submitted and a new award. He does not want to set a precedent. Senior City Attorney, Mark Harrington, explained that the Historic Preservation Board has discretion to approve an amendment to a Historic District Grant Program award. He is not concerned about setting a precedent with this.

Chair Pro Tem Beatlebrox opened the public hearing. There were no comments. The public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the Historic District Grant Application Modification at 525 Park Avenue, according to the following:

Procedural History:

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. On February 4, 2026, the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) awarded a \$10,000 Historic District Grant for repair and exterior paint of the 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.

3. The Applicant submitted a modification application on March 27, 2026, to amend the scope of work from the February 4, 2026, Historic District Grant in the amount of \$10,000 and apply the award to upgrade the old mechanical systems and restore the stained-glass windows.
4. 525 Park Avenue is in the Main Street Redevelopment Area (RDA) which had an initial balance of \$30,000 in FY26.
 - a. In FY26, the HPB awarded \$10,000 to 525 Park Ave and \$20,000 for a separate property, both sourced from the Main Street RDA, maximizing the available funds.
 - b. The current request is to amend the scope of work for the \$10,000 grant award for 525 Park Avenue.

Findings of Fact:

1. The Historic Sites from includes images of the pointed-arch windows with stained glass on the front façade and describes the west façade (rear) alter window as “edged in Cathedral glass”; both original stained-glass windows were removed by the previous owner and temporary window treatments are currently in place.
2. The Applicant submitted a property inspection report that indicates the existing mechanical systems, including the old furnace and water heater, are beyond their service life.
3. The proposed stained-glass window replacements and mechanical system upgrades fall under the following eligible work item categories: restoring Historic features, repairing/restoring/replacing windows, and upgrading mechanical systems and are eligible for a 50% matching grant through the HDGP includes; the work.
4. 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 amended scope of work to upgrade the mechanical systems and restore the stained-glass windows at 525 Park Avenue, a Landmark Historic Site, qualifies for a Historic District Grant.
2. The Historic Preservation Board finds the February 4, 2026, Historic District Grant award for \$10,000 should be applied to the amended scope of work.

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 grant funds reimbursement, 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 Noble seconded the motion.

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

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 6:08 p.m.

Approved by _____
Douglas Stephens, Chair
Historic Preservation Board