



**PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3, 2021**

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Randy Scott-Chair, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Jack Hodgkins, John Hutchings, Douglas Stephens

EX OFFICIO MEMBERS: Gretchen Milliken, Planning Director; Rebecca Ward, Assistant Planning Director; Aiden Lillie, Planner; Mark Harrington, City Attorney; Julie Schultz, Executive Office Administrator

1. ROLL CALL

Chair Randy Scott called the meeting to order at approximately 5:00 p.m.

2. MINUTES APPROVAL

A. Consideration to Approve the Historic Preservation Board Meeting Minutes from October 6, 2021.

Action was not taken on the above matter.

3. PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

No ecomments were submitted and no hands were raised on Zoom.

4. STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Chair Scott noted that Board Member Tana Toly was not present at tonight's meeting as she was recently elected to the City Council. He pointed out that the open seat would be filled through the usual process. There was discussion as to whether Board Member Toly would attend the December meeting. City Attorney, Mark Harrington noted that she would be able to serve on the Board until she is sworn into office, but it would ultimately be up to her.

Planning Director, Gretchen Milliken stated that it had come to the Planning Department's attention that some historical siding was removed from the lower level of a home at 1049 Park Avenue. She reported that the Planning Department issued a Stop Work Order on the project, however, the historic material was destroyed when it was removed. She stated that the owner was contacted, and Staff was working with them to keep the remainder of the historical material intact and ensure that they are going through the proper channels to undertake the work that they are doing.

5. **CONTINUATIONS**

There were no continuations.

6. **WORK SESSION**

A. **Land Management Code Amendments – Accessory Apartments – The Historic Preservation Board Will Review Proposed Land Management Code Amendments that Reduce Accessory Apartment Regulations to Incentivize Construction of Long-Term Rental Units Proposed for Significant or Landmark Historic Sites on the Park City Historic Sites Inventory and in the Historic Districts in General. PL-21-05000.**

Assistant Planning Director, Rebecca Ward presented the Land Management Code Amendments regarding Accessory Apartments and explained how they might impact the Historic Districts. She presented an informational graphic on Accessory Apartments, which are also called Accessory Dwelling Units (“ADU”) or Mother-in-Law Apartments.

She reported that the current Code allows attached Accessory Apartments in the interior upper level, interior lower level, as a garage conversion, or above a garage. The Land Management Code does not currently allow for detached Accessory Apartments, which is one of the amendments under consideration.

Assistant Planning Director Ward highlighted Goal #2 of the City’s 2021 Housing Assessment and Plan, which seeks to reduce Accessory Apartment regulations to incentivize construction of these long-term rentals Citywide. Under the current Code, Accessory Apartments cannot be less than 400 square feet or more than 1,000 square feet in size. They cannot be larger than one-third of the square footage of the main home. Accessory Apartments are capped at two bedrooms. She added that the Code requires one additional parking space for each bedroom of an Accessory Apartment. There cannot be more than four Accessory Apartments within a 300-foot radius. Owners of Accessory Apartments are required to record a deed restriction against the property to ensure that the units are not used for nightly rentals. The Code requires the rental period be 30 days or longer.

Assistant Planner Ward summarized the General Plan goals to create more affordable housing and additional workforce housing. The Housing Toolbox recommended allowing attached and detached Accessory Apartments to create a diversity of housing types within neighborhoods. She referenced Goal #15 to preserve the integrity, mass, scale, compatibility, and historic fabric of the Historic Districts. In addition, this goal seeks to maintain the character, context, and scale of compatible infill development and additions. She noted that they were looking for Board input on potential special considerations for Accessory Apartments in the Historic Districts, especially for significant and landmark historic structures.

The first proposed amendment to the Code seeks to allow detached Accessory Apartments, which could result in additional paving for onsite parking and could have impacts on landscaping and relocation of significant vegetation. She reported that the current design guidelines for Accessory Structures include minimizing visual impacts of onsite parking with landscaping and complementary and integrated design. Accessory Apartments can be located at the front of the site if it would be appropriate for the streetscape or character. Some guidelines encourage the roof form, exterior materials, and architectural detailing to compliment the primary structure.

The design standards also require that Accessory Structures must be subordinate in scale to the primary structure. A rustic, bare wood look was determined to generally not be appropriate for a residential or commercial structure but could be on Accessory Structures. Although the current Code defines an Accessory Structure as “not a dwelling unit,” she explained that if detached Accessory Apartments are allowed, they would want to consider what they would look like and how they would fit in on historic sites.

Assistant Planning Director Ward added that a survey was posted to the community at the end of September. They have had quite a bit of participation and public input in this survey. She presented the results to the Board and noted that most respondents are generally in favor of allowing detached Accessory Apartments; however, most were not supportive of allowing detached Accessory Apartments on significant or landmark historic sites. Staff recommended prohibiting detached Accessory Apartments on the front of a site and instead requiring that they be set behind the single-family home if allowed. In addition, they recommended prohibiting the rustic bare wood design on any Accessory Apartment and requiring that the Accessory Apartment meet the same design guideline standards as the single-family home to blend in with the home. Staff also recommended that Accessory Apartments that are attached to a significant or landmark historic site would have their entry on a secondary or tertiary façade so that the historic façade would be preserved.

The first consideration for the Board was whether detached Accessory Apartments should be allowed. She reported that the Planning Commission was considering detached Accessory Apartments on lots in excess of 3,750 square feet and whether detached Accessory Apartments should be allowed on sites designated significant or landmark historic sites.

Board Member Jack Hodgkins sought clarification regarding whether the deed restriction would apply to all structures or just the Accessory Apartment. Assistant Planning Director Ward responded that it would encompass the entire site. Currently, the proposed deed restriction would require the property owner to live on-site to have an Accessory Apartment; however, the Planning Commission was considering whether to eliminate that requirement. She further explained that the proposed deed restriction would apply to the main dwelling and the Accessory Apartment and would require that both have at least a

90-day lease. Nightly rentals would be prohibited. It was confirmed that nightly rentals would be prohibited for all structures on the site.

Board Member Hodgkins asked about the reasoning behind Staff's recommendation to prohibit natural wood siding. Assistant Planning Director Ward explained that Staff would like the Board's input on this issue. Under the current Code, Accessory Structures are not classified as dwelling units, whereas the amendments would define Accessory Apartments as dwelling units. She commented that if the rustic look would be appropriate for a historic site, they could address that in the design guidelines.

It was noted by Board Member Hutchings that many of the sites in the Historic District might not likely be able to add an Accessory Apartment on-site while still meeting setbacks and other design requirements. He asked how these amendments would further the City's goals as discussed. Assistant Planning Director Ward noted that in HR-1 and HR-2 Districts where there is a minimum lot size of 1,875 square feet, those homes could have an Accessory Apartment within the existing footprint. Such Accessory Apartments are allowed under the existing Code. In the Historic Residential Low-Density District, the minimum lot size is 3,750 square feet, which could accommodate a detached Accessory Apartment on site.

With regard to adding a detached Accessory Apartment to a historic structure, Board Member Hutchings recounted the recommendation of the consultant that the idea would be to minimize the amount of regulation to help encourage this type of development. He felt there would be enough mitigation by going through the design process that they would not even need to get into whether the Accessory Apartment was proposed for a significant or landmark historic site. He remarked that the fact that a site is historic should not be part of the hoop that homeowners need to navigate to have a detached Accessory Apartment. With regard to the siding issue, he felt that it would make sense to leave it to the regular design process rather than imposing another layer of regulation.

In response to an inquiry regarding whether Accessory Apartments could be temporary or permanent, Assistant Planning Director Ward responded that they could only be permanent. Board Member Hodgkins raised the prospect of prefabricated structures that could easily be installed and removed for historic purposes or other reasons. Assistant Planning Director Ward added that the design processes would not change as a result of the proposed amendments and noted that outside of the Historic Districts, prefabricated homes might be considered. She asked if the Board had an interest in carving out exceptions in the design guidelines for prefabricated structures. It was noted that prefabricated structures are just a type of construction and if it would be the easiest way to construct a structure on a particular site it could just go through the regular design process. Board Member Hutchings felt that anything that would not create special limitations in the Historic District would be preferable. He referenced a site where they used a crane to construct a home on-site in two layers.

Board Member Hutchings raised the issue of the deed restriction on nightly rentals and offered that if the City was trying to encourage this type of development he could not see limiting the property owner's ability to earn extra income by renting out their home or an Accessory Apartment on a nightly basis. He felt that a deed restriction on the entire home and Accessory Apartment would be too restrictive and queried how it could be handled.

Board Member Beatlebrox understood that taxes were reduced on a rental as long as a long-term lease was in place. She asked what incentives that might have on both the Accessory Apartment and the main home. Assistant Planning Director Ward responded that the tax reduction was for the primary and secondary ownership and reported that Staff would look into the issue. It was confirmed that the minimum required lot size of 3,750 square feet would be the equivalent of two Old Town lots.

Assistant Planning Director Ward confirmed her understanding that the overall input from the Board was to look for opportunities to allow detached Accessory Apartments, as long as they comply with the Historic District design guidelines that are applied to any other structure in the Historic District. She also confirmed that the Board felt that the minimum lot size of 3,750 square feet for a detached Accessory Apartment was reasonable and attached Accessory Apartments would continue to be allowed on smaller lots.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that the Planning Commission's input regarding maximum heights and commented that they addressed many of his issues. Assistant Planning Director Ward next requested input from the Board on parking. She explained that the current Code required one parking space for each Accessory Apartment bedroom. There could be a significant or landmark historic home that would be exempt from the parking requirement; however, if the addition of the Accessory Apartment disturbed the historic site, then under the current Code, the owner would be required to construct onsite parking.

She explained that there is an exception that would allow a property owner to go through a Conditional Use Permit review to allow for tandem parking. In that scenario, the applicant would be required to show that the tandem parking would not create an undue hardship for the neighborhood, other parking options were less desirable, and reasonable efforts have been made to encourage the use of all off-street parking. She reported that the survey results showed that parking was the number one concern of the residents. There was some support for reducing parking for Accessory Apartments located near transit stops.

Board Member Beatlebrox expressed that requiring parking would incentivize residents to have a car. In the Historic District, people use transit, and they want to attract people who need to live where they work. She felt that requiring a parking space would not be a great idea.

Board Member Holmgren offered that if she were to construct an Accessory Apartment, she would check with the Legal Department to see if she could prohibit motorized

vehicles, much like a renter could be restricted from smoking or pets. She commented that in certain areas, there is no need for having a vehicle.

Assistant Planning Director Ward suggested that they could include a prohibition in the deed restriction of vehicles on site. Board Member Holmgren wanted to know if the lease could prohibit the tenant from having a motorized vehicle.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed that if they are trying to create housing in the Historic District where there are so many in need of housing, that there should not be a great need for someone to have a car. If parking spaces are required, it would go against the reasoning behind creating these Accessory Apartments. He observed that these units would be naturally affordable units and the rents would increase if parking were required. He would eliminate the parking requirement because it contradicts the purpose of Accessory Apartments.

Board Member Hutchings echoed the prior comments and felt that there would be significant demand for small units for seasonal workers and those who work in Old Town. Requiring parking would be the biggest barrier for a property owner to put an Accessory Apartment on their site. He noted that the survey was not specifically for the Historic District, with the exception of one question regarding detached Accessory Apartments on significant or landmark historic sites. He felt that it was an entirely different issue in other parts of the City, whereas, in Old Town, it was desirable to incentivize property owners to contribute to the inventory and make these units more naturally affordable. He felt that less restriction would be better.

Chair Scott echoed these comments and expressed concern about the impact of additional parking on the historic site. He would agree with no additional parking on the historic site.

Board Member Hutchings offered that avoiding the process of a Conditional Use Permit would be helpful.

Assistant Planning Director Ward referenced the Sudbury Memo in the Staff Report and noted that there were approximately 50 permitted Accessory Apartments Citywide. The City's consultant evaluated the obstacles to these units and concluded that there was currently a straightforward review process for the majority of zoning districts. Currently, Accessory Apartments involve a Planning application without a public hearing required, whereas the three Historic Districts require a Planning Commission Conditional Use Permit. She noted that the Planning Commission expressed an interest in retaining this review process because of the impacts of parking within the Historic Districts.

She recapitulated that from a Board perspective, they would recommend that even in the Historic District, these review processes be streamlined. She sought input on any concerns about removing the Conditional Use Permit process in the Historic Districts. The Board expressed no concerns. Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that the

community was split about the degree of review that Accessory Apartments should require.

She requested input on any other concerns or issues specific to the Historic District or historic sites that should be addressed by Staff. Board Member Beatlebrox suggested that a longer lease period be considered. She felt that a 90-day minimum was almost like a nightly rental.

Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that currently, the Code requires rentals of at least 30 days. The Planning Commission discussed increasing it to 90 to 120 days. Based on their survey of other ski town communities, the Planning Commission generally settled on 90 days to provide housing for the seasonal workforce, feeling that a longer requirement might conflict with the seasonal workforce. It was noted that some people have enough money to rent an Accessory Apartment for 90 days and only use it on the weekends. Chair Scott agreed with the 90-day minimum, as it would be the seasonal workers they were trying to help.

Board Member Hodgkins added that from an Affordable Housing standpoint, deed restrictions often have six-month lease requirements; however, that can create issues in seasonal communities such as Park City. Since an owner could not require a tenant to stay for six months, it would ultimately hurt the owner and the housing inventory. He asked about the process for garage conversion requests. Assistant Planning Director Ward explained that under the current Land Management Code, an Accessory Building receives extreme exceptions from setbacks, however, Accessory Buildings cannot be a dwelling unit. Converting a garage to a dwelling unit would have impacts that could not be mitigated on-site. She reported that the Planning Commission took the position that any dwelling unit would and should meet the same setbacks required for the single-family dwelling.

She further explained that the current Code allowed for garage conversions, with the requirement of onsite parking. For historic sites that were granted exceptions for the sole purpose of parking, lifting a historic home for parking was a policy specifically crafted to take parking off the street. She added that removing the parking requirement to convert a garage to a dwelling unit would create a larger parking impact. She stated that they have seen applications to convert a garage into increased living space.

It was noted by Board Member Hutchings that under the Land Management Code, a single-family home is required to have two parking spaces, so if an owner wanted to convert a garage for either increased living space or an Accessory Apartment, it would conflict with the Land Management Code. He felt that there would have to be a change to the Code to allow that type of conversion and stressed that such a change would then push the parking onto the street.

There was discussion regarding owners who would not need the garage to meet the site's parking requirements and how a conversion would be evaluated from a design

perspective. It was noted that the amendments regarding Accessory Apartments would be applicable not only to historic structures but would also apply to new structures. Assistant Planning Director Ward explained that the distinction would lie in whether the site was designated significant or landmark. In cases where the site went through the review process specifically as to the garage, they would need to evaluate the impacts of changing that prior approval before allowing a garage conversion.

Board Member Holmgren mentioned the bright blue house on Park Avenue as an example of a garage conversion into a living space. She noted that the structure still looked like a garage but was converted to living space where the owner maintained the driveway for parking.

Board Member Hodgkins returned to his prior comments regarding siding. He would consider any type of siding that was consistent with the neighborhood for an Accessory Apartment located in the back of a historic site; he noted that sometimes bare wood might be more appropriate than not. Assistant Planning Director Ward commented that the amendments were currently crafted to allow this.

7. REGULAR AGENDA

A. Historic District Grant Program – The Historic Preservation Board Will Consider Applications for the Historic District Grant Program's "Competitive Grant" Category. These Grants are to be Awarded for Projects Defined as "Preservation, Rehabilitation, and/ or Restoration" in the Land Management Code.

City Planner, Aiden Lillie explained that they received 22 applications from property owners for the fiscal year 2022 Historic District Grant Program ("Grant Program"). She stated that Staff would recommend that the Board consider these applications and forward a positive recommendation to the City Council for 21 of these applications. Planner Lillie shared an image of the postcard sent to property owners of a historic landmark or significant historic sites in the Park City Historic District. She also presented an overview of the applications received showing the amounts requested by each applicant, the fund that would supply these monies, and the proposed work. She noted that this review was published for public review.

She presented a map of the Main Street Redevelopment Area ("RDA") and the Lower Park RDA. She reported that this year Staff had a total of \$127,136 to award. Of that amount, \$50,000 came from the Lower Park RDA, \$30,000 came from the Main Street RDA, and the balance of \$47,136 came from the General Fund. The funds applied for totaled \$635,805.62. She explained that on September 29, 2021, Staff evaluated and scored each of the applications using consistent criteria to ensure that each application would achieve the goals of the Grant Program and would align with the Grant Program's Mission Statement.

Planner Lillie explained that in evaluating these applications, Staff recommended that the applicants receive a percentage of funds applied for based on their evaluation score. She noted that the postcard notice stated that funds would be capped at \$15,000. She explained that if an applicant applied for \$50,000 and received a score of 44% based on the consistent criteria applied by Staff, they would be awarded a maximum of 44% of the \$15,000 cap, or \$6,600.

Planner Lillie stated that Staff recommended the denial of one application, which is the Thames and Silver King Shaft Study Grant because they did not find that the Study Grant was within the scope of the Grant Program. She read the scope of work for this grant request and stated that Staff wanted to discuss expanding the scope of the Grant Program in a Work Session on January 5, 2022, as well as some other items to revisit for next year's Grant Program. She noted that the same applicant applied for a separate grant to stabilize a separate structure and Staff recommended approval of the second application.

Planner Lillie reported that as a result of Staff's evaluations, \$126,970 of the available funds would be awarded. This amount was broken down as follows: \$44,840 from the General Fund; \$49,000 from the Lower Park RDA; and \$33,000 from the Main Street RDA, with the excess taken from the General Fund. Any funds not claimed would be added to the Emergency Grant, which is awarded on a rolling basis.

Board Member Hutchings asked if the remainder in each of the funds would roll over to the next fiscal year. Planner Lillie responded that in the past few years, the excess has not rolled over; however, they have been working with the Budget and Accounting Departments to determine if they could make that happen. She suggested that they discuss this further during the January Work Session.

Planner Lillie presented a chart with the addresses and proposed award amounts. Board Member Beatlebrox expressed surprise at the low scores and asked for an explanation. Planner Lillie explained that Staff set up the criteria based on what was sought to be achieved. Staff scored each application based on how closely the applicant met the criteria, with 36 as the maximum total score. Many applicants scored in the range of 20 out of the 36 total points because their application did not closely meet the exact goals of the Grant Program. Board Member Beatlebrox suggested revisiting the criteria in the Work Session. Planner Lillie confirmed that the criteria would be discussed.

Board Member Hodgkins questioned the point of the criteria if the applications would be funded anyway. He felt that the evaluation score was helpful to determine where to spend the money and would assume that they would have more applications than available monies. He asked why they decided to partially fund everything as opposed to funding only those applications that they thought met the criteria better than others.

Planner Lillie explained that all of the applications met the criteria of the Grant Program and the Land Management Code. The evaluation scores compared the applications to the highest possible score and none of them aligned completely with the goals of the

Grant Program. She added that Staff felt it would be more beneficial and efficient to award partial funds to everyone. The Board, however, has the power to recommend awarding the funds using a different methodology. She explained that the higher scores were given to those who prioritized preservation over replacement. She used the example of repairing a window as opposed to replacing it and noted that while replacing a window would still be within the scope of the Grant Program, it would be scored lower than an applicant who proposed to repair a window.

Chair Scott suggested that Planner Lillie present three to four of the applications at the January 2022 Work Session so they could work through the actual applications. He commented that they created the Grant Program from scratch knowing that it would be a work in progress.

Board Member Hutchings agreed with Board Member Hodgkins' comments and noted that when they revamped the Grant Program, the scoring was not intended to award everyone a grant because they assumed that there would be applications that they were not looking to fund. He felt that the scoring process would provide Staff a way to look at some of the projects that might encourage restoration or better restoration within the community. He referenced the applications for total restorations, as compared with the applications for painting or re-roofing. He was disturbed by the request for funds for painting and re-roofing and as part of his analysis, he removed painting and roofing costs. He did not want to turn the Grant Program into a way for owners of historic homes to use it for normal maintenance. He commented that out of the total amounts requested, \$223,000 was for painting and new roofs. If those costs were backed out, there would be an extra \$21,000 that could be awarded to other grant applicants whose projects would entail more work and provide more benefit for the community.

He noted that in the past, they recognized that a historic structure might have been threatened because it needed a new roof; however, the City is no longer in that situation. He reiterated that roofing is a maintenance item.

Planning Director Milliken acknowledged these comments and added that as they went through the process they realized that there was work to be done on the criteria so that they would weed out those types of projects. She explained that while some applications did not score well, they felt that an award was appropriate based on the work proposed. She stated that an application would score higher if it sought to restore original windows; however, there are a lot of homes that do not have the original windows where the applicant proposed taking out windows installed in the 1970s to install windows that would be more appropriate to the house's historical character.

Board Member Hutchings had no issue with the scoring in the sense that it was subjective and was utilized to assist with the judgment calls made on the applications. He expected that when they address this in January, they would be able to come up with a better way to fine-tune the scoring. He reiterated that the Grant Program has never been used to provide money to an applicant by virtue of their application. He added that in the past

they tried to recognize historic restorations that could be used to highlight the Grant Program and help the Planners in their design review process with an applicant.

Board Member Hodgkins added that the intent of the Grant Program was to allow homeowners to go the extra mile to preserve a structure that they would not have otherwise done versus being reimbursed for a project they would undertake in any event. He felt that competitive should really be competitive, and it would allow Staff to focus on good preservation projects. It was also noted that a competitive process would also encourage better preservation.

Assistant Planning Director Ward added that Staff reviewed all of the meeting minutes going back several years to track how this Grant Program evolved over time. She noted that they look forward to the January Work Session to fine-tune this process. She also explained that they looked at the information provided to the applicants, and they did not really give the applicants the opportunity to provide all of the details that they would like to see for a project. She reiterated that this is one of the items they look forward to discussing in January. They want to ensure that the criteria and the expectation for these competitive grants are clear from the beginning so that the applicant is aware of those expectations. In response to an inquiry, Assistant Planning Director Ward referenced the application attached as an exhibit to the Staff Report; the \$15,000 cap was included in the postcard notice.

Board Member Hutchings asked if there was an expectation within the community that simply because an owner applied for a grant that they would receive money. He specifically referenced painting and felt that by awarding grants for things like painting or roofing, they were establishing that expectation. The collective surprise of the Board with the number of applications submitted this year was nice, but they would not want to send the wrong message about awarding these grants. He also raised the issue of how they could market this Grant Program to encourage historic restoration. In the past, the Park City Historical Society would award grants as part of the branding of the idea of quality restoration. He felt that the reasoning behind these grants was being watered down with the way applications were being processed.

With regard to the window example referenced by Planning Director Milliken, it was noted by a Board Member that more points should be allowed for the more historic replications proposed by an applicant. It was recognized that because this is not part of the Land Management Code, these would be judgment calls that Staff and/or the Board could make in evaluating these applications. While there is more consistency now, they need to be aware of not sending the wrong message with the awards being made. It was suggested that Staff provide the Board with sample applications prior to the January Work Session so that the Board Members could also score them.

Chair Scott commented on the information provided to the applicants and read the description of eligible work, which included repairing or replacing windows, re-pointing masonry, exterior painting, and electrical updates. Board Member Hutchings commented

that this information was consistent with the Grant Program from its inception. On some occasions, exterior painting was awarded and others it was not depending upon the structure and the judgment call of Staff. He did not recall much in the way of negative impacts that arose from denials in the past.

Board Member Hodgkins questioned whether money should be going toward painting at all. He felt that roofing presented another issue because there could be more appropriate roof looks for historic structures, so they might consider including roofing as an allowed project.

Board Member Holmgren recounted her personal experience where her roof slid off and she was grateful to have received funds from the Grant Program that paid half the cost of that repair. She commented that exterior paint should be considered maintenance and recalled a meeting where they discussed removing painting from the list of allowable projects. Planner Lillie confirmed that past minutes reflect that the Board requested painting be removed; however, when she published the notice prepared by prior Staff it remained in as an allowed project.

Board Member Holmgren stated that the Grant Program was initially implemented to address electrical upgrades since many of the historic homes were wired with extension cords. But as far general maintenance, those items should not be included. Planning Director Milliken added that they would have liked to see more detail and information from the applicants. She agreed that painting was more of a regular maintenance item; however, there might be situations that provide the good cause to allow for the paint to preserve historic material. It would be hard to know that, however, without a detailed application.

Board Member Beatlebrox recalled prior discussions involving a long-time homeowner who needed their entire house painted and did not have the income that new homeowners bring to Park City. They also discussed having the Board involved in these decisions, which might include site visits. She would like to discuss this further in January.

Board Member Hodgkins agreed that they want to keep people in their homes, and the situation referenced above might involve the award of an Emergency Grant.

A question was raised about the amounts in the Emergency Fund. Planner Lillie responded that there would be approximately \$1,000 left. She noted, however, that there were a lot of funds left over from fiscal year 2021, and they have been discussing whether they might be able to include these monies in the Emergency Fund. The leftover funds total approximately \$22,000.

Planner Lillie explained that Staff received public comment prior to this meeting as follows:

"I am a taxi driver on the Main Street and the tourists like the old houses that are preserved as well as how colorful they are. I think investing in these restoration projects means investing in the economy of Park City because the characteristic buildings of Park City are an attraction for both locals and tourists."

Planner Lillie reported that Staff recommended the Board review the evaluations for the Grant Program and forward a recommendation to City Council for their determination.

Chair Scott opened the public hearing and noted that there were public comments included in the chat as well as those who raised their hands to speak.

Sally Elliott added some historical perspective and stated that Old Town has changed. When the Old Town Grant Program began, most of the homes in Old Town were in need of improvement and most of the owners of those homes did not have substantial funds to paint, re-roof, or shore up the structures. Since the Grant Program began, Old Town has become the most desirable place to live and people with financial resources are able to add on to and maintain their homes. She applauded the decision of the Board to question whether painting or re-roofing continued to be a priority for the Historic District Commission ("HDC"). In the past, grants for painting or re-roofing were necessary, however now she felt it was no longer necessary. She recalled when it was a big deal to help people pay for lifting their homes to install better foundations. She commented that things have changed, and the Board is on the right track.

Planner Lillie read a question from the chat that regarding the variables that define the score. She explained that as Staff evaluated each application, they used a score chart based on the Historic District Grant Program's Mission Statement, which explained that the Grant Program was designed to financially incentivize the preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration of historic structures to create a community that honors its past and encourages historic preservation.

Planner Lillie also added that the purpose of the Grant Program was to assist in offsetting the costs of preservation, rehabilitation, and restoration work. She explained that they looked at how the work would help stabilize the property, visually enhance the community, how it would be affected from the public right-of-way as well as other criteria they took from the 2008 Duvall Study. She described the history of the Grant Program and noted that it had been in existence since 1987 until it was paused in 2015 to better re-evaluate the program.

Melanie Young reported that she served on HDC in the past and she has lived in Old Town for 30 years. She has one of the few homes that still has its original siding, fascia, windows, and doors. She felt that painting was key because her home is all wood. Her home is a significant landmark structure, and she does not have unlimited funds to renovate. She noted that she would need grant funds to paint her home in order to preserve it. She understood that many would like things for aesthetics. When she served on the HDC, they would conduct site visits to evaluate grant requests and she felt it

important to take a close look at what people have done and want to do to preserve their building. Ms. Young reiterated that she does not have the \$30,000 to paint her house.

An Unidentified Male Speaker stated that he purchased his home at 416 Park Avenue in 1988 and the Grant Program helped him. Many wanted the home to be torn down and re-built for the same price that he spent to renovate it. He noted that the Mayor of Park City-owned his house in approximately 1910. The speaker commented that even though he has owned the home for a long time, he does not have the money to put into the house. He has been a good resident by restoring the house himself and does not intend to leave Park City. He has worked hard to keep the house significant. He has problems with snowplows and snow shed from the north and south and has done his best to preserve the home without a lot of help. He stated that the house has a lot of issues, and he would like some help preserving it, which would be to everyone's benefit.

There were no further public comments.

Chair Scott recalled that they wanted to make the application process easy, but they also wanted a story to be told. He recalled situations where during the renovation process, owners sought grants that were not considered preservation, and they wanted to find ways to rank those requests differently. He noted that there was work to be done.

Due to the lack of information and interpretation, Board Member Hodgkins stated that Staff decided to distribute the funds amongst all eligible applicants regardless of the scores. Planner Lillie explained that the amount of each award was based on the applicant's score as applied to the \$15,000 cap. Therefore, if an applicant applied for \$100,000, and their score was 50%, they would be awarded \$7,500. It was noted that this calculation would be the same for an applicant who applied for \$20,000.

Planning Director Milliken added that if an applicant applied for an amount less than the \$15,000 cap, their score would be applied to the amount requested rather than the \$15,000 cap. In response to an inquiry, she explained that affordability was part of the criteria, but was impossible to determine based on the applications received. Planner Lillie added that the application included an area for a brief project description that allowed the applicant to provide a narrative of the proposed work. She confirmed that Staff did not interview the applicants.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the initial discussions on the Grant Program included residency and if primary residencies should have preference. He noted that this would also go to the issue of affordability. It was mentioned that those discussions were held, but the focus was to on the Board's task as the stewards of the property. It was suggested that the Emergency Fund be looked at differently in terms of the criteria because there is clearly a social aspect involved. It was acknowledged that Staff could provide residents with information that they could also be eligible for the State Historic Credit that would include painting of their historic house. Preservation Utah also has funds that they loan out specifically for historic preservation projects.

Planner Lillie agreed that Staff could better inform residents of the other programs. There was discussion about whether the State Tax Credit Program was for income property only and the differences between the Federal and State programs. Planner Lillie indicated that they would address this in further detail at the January Work Session. For the current applications, she reported that Staff was scheduled to present this to the City Council on November 18, 2021, based on the timeline provided to the applicants. She stated that the Board had the authority to continue this item.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that his year involved a learning curve, and they would not have any better solutions for this year. He did not, however, want to set a precedent that this is how the Grant Program would operate going forward, and that needed to be made clear to the City Council.

Board Member Hutchings echoed the comments of Board Member Hodgkins.

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to recommend the grants contained in the Meeting Packet, pursuant to the Staff recommendation, to the City Council for consideration on November 18, 2021. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

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

- B. 427 Main Street – Historic District Design Review – The Planning Department Issued a Historic District Design Review for Emergency Repair Work to Remove a Chimney with a Condition of Approval the Applicant Come Before the Historic Preservation Board to Determine Material Deconstruction or Reconstruction. The Applicant Requested the Historic Preservation Board Allow for Permanent Removal of the Chimney. On October 6, 2021, the Historic Preservation Board Denied the Applicant's Request, Requiring the 2 Park City Page 3 Applicant to Reconstruct the Chimney. PL-21-04957.**

Assistant Planning Director Ward reported that the direction received from the October 6, 2021, meeting was that Staff was to prepare a draft that ratified the denial of the application seeking permanent removal of the chimney at this location. She explained that the draft was provided in the Staff Report and if there were any Findings of Fact that required amendment, they could discuss those.

She explained that the Board was to consider formally ratifying its denial of the application for the permanent removal of the non-functioning chimney. The chimney would be required to be reconstructed with the salvaged brick and appropriate material as approved through the Historic District design review process required as part of the reconstruction of the chimney.

In response to an inquiry, Assistant Planning Director Ward explained that “final action” as defined in the Land Management Code is the date that the Board ratifies the written determination.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to ratify the Board’s decision denying the permanent removal of the non-functioning chimney at 427 Main Street, as set forth in the Final Action Letter included in the Staff Report. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

8. ADJOURN

MOTION: Board Member Hodgkins moved to ADJOURN. Board Member Hutchings seconded the motion.

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

The Historic Preservation Board Meeting adjourned at approximately 6:30 p.m.

Approved by _____
Randy Scott, Chair
Historic Preservation Board