

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF JULY 18, 2012

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Puggy Holmgren, Dave McFawn, Katherine Matsumoto-Gray, David White, Marian Crosby, John Kenworthy

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington; Francisco Astorga, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah

---

REGULAR MEETING – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

ROLL CALL

All Board Members were present except for Judy McKie.

Election of Chair

Board member McFawn nominated David McFawn as the Chair of the Historic Preservation Board. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair McFawn opened the meeting at 5:07 p.m.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside Avenue, commented on how much she had learned from working with the Staff during the HDDR and the appeal process for 335 Woodside Avenue. She requested that the HPB allow her time at a future meeting to show what she learned and what issues came up. She believed the information could be applied generally in future situations. She had asked Planner Astorga to tag team with her on everything they learned. David White would also have the opportunity make comments, since he was the project architect and was prohibited from commenting in the appeal hearing.

Planner Astorga thought Ms. Meintsma's request to share her experience could be accommodated. Director Eddington thought it was a good idea. Chair McFawn agreed. It would also help the new Board members gain an understanding of the HDDR process.

Chair McFawn thanked Ms. Meintsma for taking the initiative to prepare a presentation for the Board. Time would be scheduled during a future work session once Ms. Meintsma gathers all the information. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray wanted to know what types of things in the process would be within the HPB purview. Ms. Meintsma stated that she would be presenting research that was used to evaluate the significance of the house and how that information could be interpreted in different ways. There were also new discoveries of available materials during different time periods. A lot of details show how buildings manifested at the turn of the century and what happened to them through the years. Ms. Meintsma remarked that it was all a big puzzle and you have to put the pieces together to see the details of the picture.

Planner Astorga believed there would be a benefit to comparing a physical conditions report to an intensive level survey, which was the information Ruth was seeking during the appeal process. Board member White believed it was important to also talk about the evaluation of the process as a whole. Board member Matsumoto-Gray thought it would be useful to do that work session with an eye towards the future. Board member White agreed. Ms. Meintsma commented on the benefit of brainstorming ideas with the Staff. She believed everything learned could be applied in some way to almost any future structure.

## STAFF/BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

### Historic Preservation Award Update

Board member Matsumoto-Gray reported that she and Board Member McKie attended the Arts Advisory Board meeting and provided a general summary of what the HPB was thinking in terms of artwork for the Preservation Award. The Arts Board would suggest a list of artists; however, since it is the HPB project and award, they recommended that the HPB choose the artist. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray thought it would be beneficial to invite the Arts Board to meet with the HPB to collaborate on the selection. She personally was not qualified to select an artist and would be more comfortable involving the Arts Board.

Director Eddington recalled from last year that the HPB selected a subcommittee of three members who interviewed the artist and recommended the artwork. He reported that the Arts Advisory Board submitted a list of six recommended artists. He suggested that the HPB form another subcommittee and decide if they want to interview all six artists or narrow the list. Director Eddington stated that the HPB could invite a member from the Arts Board to sit on the subcommittee.

Director Eddington provided a brief overview of the Preservation Award for the benefit of Marian Crosby and John Kenworthy, the new Board members.

City Council Member Liza Simpson stated that the Public Art Advisory Board has a mission of choosing art that is mostly out and around in the community. She believed the HPB could choose whatever piece they wanted without overstepping their bounds in this narrow instance of reflecting the historic fabric. The HPB had the option to either involve the Arts Board or to make the decision on their own. Since it is a narrow interpretation of an award for a building or an adaptive reuse that was chosen by the HPB, and because it is not the typical public art that is displayed in the community, they should not feel obligated to follow the public art procedures.

Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that the involvement of the Arts Advisory Board for public art is mandated when funds come from the art fund. The artwork related to the Preservation Award is coming from HPB funds and, therefore, the HPB can have independence from the Arts Board.

Board Member White believed the HBP members had the ability and diversity to choose the artist for their own project. Board Member Holmgren agreed.

The Board discussed the process for choosing an artist. Director Eddington stated that last year the HPB made a decision not to put constraints on the type of art or set specific criteria for choosing the artist. It was based on recommendations from the Art Board and interviews by the HPB subcommittee. He noted that the art piece last year was a 20 x 30 oil painting that hangs in the engineering reception office. Future pieces would be displayed in the conference rooms.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray was the only Board member who preferred to work with the Arts Board. The remaining Board members thought the HPB was capable of making the selection. Chair McFawn noted that the Arts Board recommended six artists based on the information provided by Board Members Matsumoto-Gray and McKie. The Arts Board had narrowed the search and gave the HPB a good place to start. Board Member White noted that artists who were interviewed but not chosen last year were invited to submit their name in future years. The Planning Department still had those names on file.

Director Eddington suggested that the HPB choose one other Board member to be on the subcommittee with Board Members McKie and Matsumoto-Gray to interview the artists. The Staff would provide the names of the six artists recommended by the Arts Board, as well as the names from last year. He believed it would be a total of ten artists and the Board could decide whether or not to interview all ten. Board member White offered to sit on the subcommittee as the replacement for Alan Natt, who was on the subcommittee last year.

Director Eddington noted that the budget was approximately \$1,000. The limited budget may determine which artists are interested.

#### Update on the Washington School Inn

Director Eddington reported that the Washington School Inn was still pursuing final approvals to make the corrections to their conditional use permit. The applicant was working with the Building and Planning Departments to finalize the issues, and everything was going well. There is no deadline, but the Washington School Inn cannot obtain their final certificate of occupancy until the issues are resolved.

Board Member Kenworthy asked if the HPB had a deadline for selecting the award recipient. Director Eddington replied that there was no deadline but the award is given out annually this time of year. Board Member Kenworthy asked if there were other candidates besides the Washington School Inn. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray stated that 1101 Norfolk and 1059 Park Avenue were on the list, and she explained why each one was considered to be an appropriate candidate for the Preservation Award. Board Member Kenworthy asked if another structure would only be selected in the event that the Washington Inn School was not eligible. Director Eddington explained that the Board had not selected a final recipient, but they were favoring the Washington School Inn.

Planner Astorga stated that he had not prepared a power point presentation this evening based on a recommendation by the Planning Commission. All of the exhibits in the

power point were included in the packet and they felt it was more efficient to work from the packet since they have the ability to zoom in and out and look at different pages. If the HPB prefers the power point format they should tell the Staff.

Board Member White referred to the grant for 335 Woodside. He disclosed that he is the project architect and questioned whether or not he needed to recuse himself. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that Mr. White could sit in the back of the room and listen to the discussion, but because he is a Board member, it would not be appropriate to appear on behalf of an applicant. Board Member White noted that the contractor, Lance Kincaid, was representing the applicant this evening.

Board Member Kenworthy disclosed that he owns at home at 214 Woodside Avenue, but he did not believe that would affect his decision this evening.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she was not on the Board when she was awarded a grant for her roof, but questioned whether she needed to recuse herself. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that her disclosure was sufficient and she did not need to be recused. Board Member Holmgren wanted everyone to be aware that the purple house has a green roof. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the Staff has been changing the criteria for clarity.

#### REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

##### 334 Marsac Avenue - Grant (Application #PL-12-01559)

Planner Astorga reviewed the grant application at 334 Marsac Avenue. He noted that the property owner, Dottie Beck, was out of the Country until late October and she was being represented by Michael Sussman.

Planner Astorga reported that the structure at 334 Marsac was listed on the Historic Sites Inventory as a landmark structure, and is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The structure was built around 1898. The property owner submitted a pre-application for Historic District Design Review, as required by Code, to replace the roof shingles. He noted that the roof is in very bad condition. On advice from the staff, Ms. Beck submitted the grant application.

Planner Astorga stated that this was a matching grant. The applicant pays for the work out-of-pocket and the grant amount awarded by the HPB is refunded when the work is completed.

Planner Astorga pointed out a discrepancy found on the site. There appears to be a parking area that was not built to City standards, and the retaining wall around it is not compatible with historic materials. In doing research, the Staff was unable to find a building permit for such an improvement. After corresponding with Ms. Beck and Mr. Sussman, they found that the improvements were done prior to Ms. Beck owning the property. Therefore, the Staff was having a difficult time finding out when the improvements were built.

The Staff recommended that the Planning Commission consider awarding the grant amount indicated in the Staff report. Planner Astorga noted that the project is located in the Main Street RDA, which has no funds available. For projects within the Main Street RDA, the City uses the Capital Improvements Account, which is set aside specifically for historic incentives. The current amount in the CIP that is allocated for historic incentive grants is \$52,247.

Planner Astorga stated that the re-roof request is identified in the historic grant program as a maintenance issue and the responsibility of the property owner. However, it can be considered an eligible expense on a case by case basis. He noted that the HPB has awarded grants in the past for this same type of work.

Board Member Kenworthy asked if there was a contingency upon some kind of re-development of the parking area. Planner Astorga stated that it has been difficult trying to work with the property owner because she left the Country the day after submitting the application. The Staff plans to begin working with the Code Enforcement officers to determine whether the parking space is in its correct location and whether it encroaches on the City's right-of-way. A contingency would depend on how the property owner responds. Another solution would be to completely remove the parking space and restore it to its original native vegetation, assuming that parking could be provided elsewhere. This is a historic structure and the applicant is not required to provide off-street parking. Planner Astorga noted that there were five or six available parking spaces directly across the street on Marsac Avenue.

Board Member Crosby asked if removing the parking space would have any effect on the retaining wall. Planner Astorga replied that the retaining wall would also be removed. He remarked that the material used in the retaining wall would not be approved in the Historic District Design Review. Director Eddington stated that the retaining wall may be structurally sound as built. If that is the case, it could be faced with a similar flagstone seen on the front retaining wall, and that would be acceptable for the HDDR. In its current condition it would not comply with the Historic District Design Guidelines.

Board Member Crosby asked if the applicant could revise her application to include the retaining wall or if it would be a separate and additional application. Planner Astorga stated that a grant application is for historic structures and not new improvements. Because the parking pad was not there historically, he did not believe it could be considered for a grant application.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray clarified that the application was for the roof. The parking space issue only came up during the site review. Planner Astorga replied that this was correct.

Board Member White asked if the house was currently occupied by the owner or used as a rental. Mr. Sussman replied that the house is Ms. Beck's home. She teaches skiing in Park City and in New Zealand, so she is out of the Country from June to October. The house is not used as a rental and remains unoccupied when she is gone.

Board Member White believed the HPB had approved grants for roofs on landmark structures in the past. Board Member Holmgren reported that her house was approved because it was a landmark structure and half the roof was off. Her grant came from the Lower Park Avenue RDA and that fund still has money available.

Chair McFawn asked if the Main Street RDA would be replenished. Director Eddington answered no. However, they could work with the budget department and ask if the City Council was interested in replenishing some of those funds.

Chair McFawn referred to items 7, 10 and 11 on the list, and asked if those items were new from what Ms. Beck currently has. Planner Astorga stated that Item 7 is the winter guard. He was unsure whether there is an existing winter guard, but the grant covers wear and tear and he believed that was an item that normally gets replaced with the roof. Board Member White explained that in this climate a winter guard is essential. He understood that the proposal was to remove everything and re-do the roof from the substructure up.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray thought the grant was a good way to help promote preserving landmark structures.

Director Eddington asked if the Board wanted to include a condition of approval relative to resolving the parking and the retaining wall.

Board Member Kenworthy referred to the photo on page 19 of the Staff report which showed the beauty of the original retaining wall and the decking. He supported replacing the roof, but he would also like to find a way to help bring back a similar retaining wall. Since the owner does not use the parking space and there is parking across the street, Board Member Kenworthy suggested that the owner restore the area to its original look sometime in the future as a condition of the grant.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray did not favor placing conditions on grants. The grant program is a way to financially help people maintain their historic property. If the goal is to return structures to the original as much as possible, they run the risk of scaring people away from preservation if the grant can be conditioned on fixing another element. Board Member Holmgren agreed.

MOTION: Board Member Matsumoto-Gray moved to APPROVE the grant for 334 Marsac Avenue in the amount of \$5,875, and for the funds to come from the General CIP. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

61 Daly Avenue - Grant  
(Application #PL-12-01585)

Planner Astorga reviewed the grant application for 61 Daly Avenue. A design review application was submitted to repair two windows on the front facade. Planner Astorga had received additional information from the contractor, Dale Covington, indicating that based on further analysis and exploratory work on the window, the window would be

impossible to repair. He noted that work had begun on the site but nothing was done to the windows. The applicant was aware of the policy that funds could not be awarded if the work was started or completed. Correspondence from Mr. Covington indicated that the cost to replace the window was the same as the cost to repair it. The total cost to replace the window was \$2,000 and the applicant was requesting a grant in the amount of \$1,000. Planner Astorga stated that research on grants awarded since 2005 showed that the smallest grant amount was \$1500.

Mr. Covington, representing the applicant, provided information on the proposed new windows, which would look identical to the existing window. He noted that there is evidence that the existing windows were not the original windows.

Planner Astorga noted that the windows may not be the original but they were the same in style and shape. He believed this application for window replacement was a good candidate for historic preservation. He clarified that the window placement would not be shifted and the size of the opening would stay the same.

Chair McFawn asked about the exterior material. Mr. Covington stated that the new windows would be a primed wood.

Planner Astorga reported that this was a landmark structure. The Staff had a pre-application conference with Mr. Covington and the applicant, Delphine Campee. The applicant went a step further and applied for the full Historic District Design Review. The appropriate ten day public comment period was enforced and the Staff had not received any comments from the neighbors. The Historic District Design Review was approved.

Board Member Crosby asked Mr. Covington to describe the other work that was done. Mr. Covington stated that two windows were added to the back of the house that were identical to the windows being proposed for the front, minus the triple light on the top sash. The windows would be double-hung.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to APPROVE the grant for 61 Daly Avenue in the amount of \$1,000 and for the funds to be taken from the CIP Fund. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Holmgren thanks Mr. Covington for doing a great job.

335 Woodside Avenue - Grant  
(Application #PL-12-01596)

Board Member White recused himself and left the room.

Chair McFawn noted that the background section stated that the structure is located at 61 Daly Avenue. He assumed it was an error and should be corrected to 335 Woodside Avenue. Planner Astorga replied that this was correct.

Planner Astorga reported that this property came before the HPB two months ago on an appeal by Ruth Meintsma. The applicant, John Watkins, delayed applying for a building permit for the purpose of requesting the grant indicated in the application. Unlike the last application, this grant request was the largest amount requested since 2005.

Planner Astorga outlined the major work for the structure at 335 Woodside. The structure will be lifted temporarily in order to build a full foundation and basement. As it currently sits, the structure slants towards the front. Lance Kincaid, representing the applicant, stated that it was 11" katy-corner from the back to the front and that would be rectified. An addition is proposed to be added to the back and also in the basement level as a garage.

Planner Astorga explained that the applicant for this grant was for the rehabilitation and remodel of the historic site only. Money necessary to accommodate the addition was not part of the grant application because it is ineligible under the grant program. The applicant was requesting funds for siding, the windows, foundation work, the exterior paint and roof. The Staff report outlined all the items in the grant packets as well as a breakdown of individual costs. The total proposed improvements would be approximately \$132,000. The matching grant is half of the total cost at approximately \$66,000.

Planner Astorga remarked that the Staff reviewed the request, and based on their analysis, determined that the foundation is completely necessary for rehabilitation of the structure; but not the full basement. The Staff removed some items from the recommendation since the proposal was a combination foundation and an entire new floor. Planner Astorga stated that the Staff decided to keep the roof as an eligible item because the historic structure is directly affected by this portion.

The Staff recommendation reduced the cost of the matching funds to \$30,000. The HPB had the option to follow the Staff recommendation, to award the remaining amount in the CIP fund, or to award a lesser amount. Planner Astorga noted that the full amount requested could not be awarded because it exceeds the \$45,000 balance in the CIP. Planner Astorga reviewed the estimated cost breakdown of the recommended items. The roof structure was \$18,000; the wall structure was \$29,000; the siding and trim was \$8,000; and the windows and doors at \$5,000 for a total of \$60,000.

The Staff had removed the excavation, raising of the historic structure and the footings and foundation from the grant request. The items were associated with the historic structure but they were also associated with the new addition and the basement.

Lance Kincaid, representing the applicant, clarified that the excavation cost was to excavate under the historic house and not the back portion for the addition. Planner Astorga explained that even though it was under the historic house, the excavation was for the purpose of accommodating the basement as a new addition.

Board Member Kenworthy asked if the grant funds had a time limit. Patricia Abdullah explained that per the grant agreement, the applicant has 60 days to pull the building permit and 9 months to complete the construction. Once construction is completed, receipts could be submitted for reimbursement.

Board Member Holmgren confirmed that the Staff was recommending the roof restructure, walls restructure and stabilization, siding and trim, windows and doors and painting. Planner Astorga clarified that the Staff had not included painting in the \$60,000 cost. He noted that the HPB could include painting if they decide to award the grant. Mr. Kincaid pointed out that the house would be repainted because it is currently lead-based paint.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray asked for clarification of the roof restructure. Mr. Kincaid stated that the existing roof is 2 x 4's. The entire roof would need to be restructured because the existing roof cannot support a full house. All the interior walls were removed from the structure and it is supported by temporary bracing.

Board Member Crosby requested further clarification on the 9 month completion requirement. Mr. Kincaid stated that the work outlined under the grant could be completed in 9 months. Planner Astorga stated that in order to keep the building permit active, the Building Department requires active construction every 180 days, and an inspection by the Building Department every 180 days. That is how the Building Department interprets an active building permit.

Chair McFawn asked how long the building permit can remain active. Planner Astorga replied that it depends on various factors such as the absence of work or the extent of the work done. That determination is left to the Chief Building Official. Under current policy, it is not as easy to obtain a building extension as it was in the past.

Chair McFawn stated that from the standpoint of a grant application, he favored ruling out painting because it is maintenance that every homeowner has to do. He noted that the roof restructure would be the next thing after the excavation is done and the house is put back in place. He asked Mr. Kincaid to estimate how long it would take to reach that point. Mr. Kincaid stated that with winter coming, it was unrealistic to make that prediction. However, in 9 months the doors and windows would be in place on the historic structure.

Board Member Kenworthy asked whether the house would be owner/occupied or rented. Mr. Kincaid stated that it was being built for two families and the two families intend to own it forever. It will be owner/occupied.

Planner Astorga explained that if the HPB awards the grant and the owners sold the structure, they would have to repay some of the grant amount. Patricia stated that the amount diminishes every year, but it is amortized over five years. If they sell the structure within five years the owner would have to pay back a portion of the grant they were awarded. The payback is 100% the first year, 80% the second year, etc., until the fifth year. Board Member McFawn pointed out that the applicant does not receive the funds until the work is complete. Patricia remarked that the grant is a trust deed.

Planner Astorga reported that through the approved Historic District Design Review and based on the square footage of the structure, the applicant chose to put a lien on the property for the Historic Preservation Guarantee in the amount of \$140,000, and that lien was recorded. If excavation begins and the work is not completed for any reason, the

City can use the \$140,000 from the lien to hire a contractor to complete the work on the historic structure only.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray felt it was important for the Board to discuss the long-term sustainability of the grant program and the funds. She favors the grant program and it needs to continue. She was concerned about the dwindling funds because one large request could end the program. Board Member Matsumoto-Gray stated that in her opinion, consideration of this particular grant request was tied up with the funding issue because it is a massive amount.

Director Eddington stated that there have been discussions regarding additional funds at the most recent budget hearing. It was noted that there was still some money in the Lower Park Avenue RDA and at that time there was \$50,000 in the CIP. Director Eddington believed the City Council was committed to replenishing the funds, but it was not done during this budget cycle.

Chair McFawn shared the concerns expressed by Board Member Matsumoto-Gray. The Board asked Council Member Simpson to comment on the sustainability of the grant program and the City's intention to continue to allocate money to redevelopment grants.

Council Member Simpson replied that it was not a question she could quickly answer. There has been discussion about extending one of the RDAs. The Main Street RDA is not up for renewal yet. Coming out of the economic storm they have been in over the last few years, the City is financially healthy. There is a commitment at the City Council level and the City Management level to fund historic preservation, but how they go about doing it is still unknown. Council Member Simpson believed it would be similar to the conversation they had about funding public art. Given the draft analysis of the Historic District and its status and the general conversation four years ago at Visioning, they were talking about funding intensive level reviews for all historic buildings within the Historic District. Unfortunately, there was not enough money to make that decision. Council Member Simpson stated that there is the will to fund the grant program and the projects. The issue is finding the money and figuring out how to create a dedicated revenue stream.

Council Member Simpson encouraged the HPB to judge this grant application based on its merits. She had read the Staff report and believed the Staff had made good and valid recommendations.

Chair McFawn asked if there was a chance the grant fund would be replenished within the next 60 days. Council Member Simpson answered no.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray believed that depleting the funds was a relevant issue. She likes to encourage historic preservation projects and help people preserve their property. However, the question is the number of people they can help.

Council Member Simpson clarified that the reason why the funds would not be replenished in the next six months was because it is tied to the budget cycle, which was just completed. She anticipated a conversation regarding an ongoing revenue stream to be part of the budget talks for next year. Council Member Simpson believed the

commitment was there, but she could not give a dollar figure or a timeline when funds could be expected.

Chair McFawn also likes the ability to encourage preservation and help people when they come before them. However, it could be 1 year at a minimum before additional money is allocated.

Mr. Kincaid pointed out that there was only one month left in this year's building season. He asked if other grant requests had been submitted. Planner Astorga replied that there were no current active grant applications on file.

Chair McFawn preferred to be conservative and err on the side of caution. Director Eddington noted that different projects have different allocations. If a project does not go through in the next few months there may be a chance to transfer some of those funds to historic preservation. There was no guarantee and it was not something they could count on.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray wanted to know what had happened to the interior walls in the historic structure. Mr. Kincaid explained that three years ago the owner was unaware of the rules that applied to remodeling homes in town. The owner was fined and their project was halted. At that point bracing was designed and put in to hold up the structure.

Chair McFawn called for public input.

Ruth Meintsma, 305 Woodside, stated that she ran into Dina Blaes today and Ms. Blaes was coming back from looking at a property at 719 Park Avenue. The City was closely watching that project that was up for rehabilitation. Unfortunately, the owners had compromised the interior to the point where it can no longer be saved like it was when it was initially proposed. Ms. Meintsma thought the City should be aware that there may be situations where owners create a compromised condition and later come back and request a grant to correct the compromise they created. Ms. Meintsma stated that 335 Woodside was that situation; however, she was unsure whether the grant application included money to fix what the owner had done to compromise the structure.

Mr. Kincaid stated that the structure was falling down. There were holes in the walls and the walls were rotting. The house was going to collapse. Board Member Kenworthy remarked that he has been inside the house and it had significant defects five years ago. Board Member Kenworthy asked if the interior walls would be replaced. Mr. Kincaid replied that there would be outside structure walls, but the inside of the house would be open.

Board Member Holmgren agreed with Board Members McFawn and Matsumoto-Gray in terms of being conservative with the remaining funds.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray stated that the most important eligible items were walls, windows and doors, siding and trim. Mr. Kincaid referred to earlier comments about excavating for the basement. He noted that most of the dirt needed to be dug at least six feet to get underneath and hold up the house. It goes beyond just digging for

footings and foundation. Mr. Kincaid stated that the largest improvement in the project was putting in the foundation.

Chair McFawn pointed out that it was not strictly foundation work because a basement would also be built. Planner Astorga stated that the basement was the reason why the Staff removed the foundation from the eligible items.

After further discussion, the Board agreed to approve the grant for walls, windows and doors, and siding and trim. The full cost was approximately \$42,000 and the grant amount would be half of the cost at \$21,000.

MOTION: Board Member Matsumoto-Gray moved to award a grant for the portion of the remodel at 335 Woodside Avenue that includes restructure and stabilizing the walls, the siding and trim, and the windows and doors totaling \$42,000. The eligible amount of the grant would be \$21,000 taken from the CIP fund. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Planner Astorga thanked Patricia Abdullah for her extensive work on grant applications. The Staff appreciates the support she provides to the grant program.

#### **Miscellaneous discussion items**

Board Member Holmgren asked about the for-sale sign in front of 1119 Park Avenue.

Assistant City Attorney stated that she was involved with the Building Department when the fence was put up for safety. The owners were unresponsive to the Staff initially, but they started communicating with the Staff a few weeks ago. Director Eddington noted that the owners responded once the Staff informed them that liens would be placed on the property. The Staff was doing a physical conditions report and anything they could to preserve the structure and create a safe environment by wrapping the fence around it. The Staff knew nothing about the for-sale sign. The house will be saved, preserved or reconstructed depending on the conditions report. The Staff would keep the HPB updated.

Board Member Matsumoto-Gray asked how they could make sure that the funds allocation discussion would be on the City Council's agenda. Council Member Simpson stated that she would include their discussion as part of her liaison report to the City Council the next evening.

#### **Board Member White rejoined the meeting.**

The next HPB meeting would be the third Wednesday of the month on August 15<sup>th</sup> instead of the first Wednesday.

The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Park City Historic Preservation Board  
July 18, 2012

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Dave McFawn, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board