

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 3, 2010

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Roger Durst – Chair; Ken Martz – Vice-Chair;  
Brian Guyer, Dave McFawn, Sara Werbelow, David White

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Polly Samuels McLean, Liza Simpson, Patricia  
Abdullah

---

ROLL CALL

Chair Durst called the meeting to order at 5:03 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for Adam Opalek, who was excused. David White was expected to arrive late.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no comment.

STAFF/BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

There was no comment.

**David White arrived.**

REGULAR MEETING – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

Elect Chair

Chair Durst noted that his first year as chairman of the Board had expired. He opened the floor for nominations to elect a new chair.

MOTION: Board Member White re-nominated Roger Durst for a second term as HPB Chair. He stated that the Board is in the midst of several important programs that Roger was responsible for raising, and he felt it was important for Roger to Chair them to the end. Board Member Werbelow seconded the nomination and concurred with Board Member White on the primary reason why Roger Durst should continue as Chair.

Chair Durst reminded the Board that the HPB has a limit of two terms. If he was elected this evening, he assumed another Board member would be prepared to accept the position at the end of his second term.

Since there were not other nominations, Chair Durst called for a vote.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Assistant City Attorney, Polly Samuels McLean, noted that the Board needed to vote on the position Ken Martz currently held as Vice-Chair.

MOTION: Brian Guyer re-nominated Ken Martz to continue as the HPB Vice-Chair. David White seconded the nomination.

Since there were no other nominations, Chair Durst called for a vote.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

#### Elect Design Review Team Representative

Chair Durst noted that the Board members had previously discussed this item as a way to gain more community frontage.

Planning Director, Thomas Eddington, provided a sheet outlining in detail the HPB mission statement taken from the Code. Chair Durst stated that he had read through the LMC and identified the HPB purposes as articulated in the Code, which included 1) to preserve the City's historic character and encourage compatible design and construction to the creation and periodic update of comprehensive design guidelines for Park City's historic districts and sites; 2) to identify as early as possible and resolve conflicts between the preservation of culture resources and alternative land uses; 3) to provide input to Staff, the Planning Commission and City Council towards safeguarding the heritage of the City and protecting historic sites, buildings and or structures; 4) to recommend to the Planning Commission and City Council, ordinances that may encourage historic preservation' 4) to communicate the benefits of historic preservation for the education, prosperity and general welfare of the residents, visitors and tourists; 6) to recommendation to the City Council the development of incentive programs, either public or private, to encourage the preservation of the City's historic resources; 7) to administer all City sponsored preservation incentive programs; 8) to review all appeals on action taken by the Planning Department regarding compliance with the design guidelines for Park City's historic districts and historic sites; 9) to review and take action on all designation of sites to the Historic Sites Inventory application submitted to the City.

Chair Durst recalled that additional goals were also stated in the LMC. When he reviewed that against their limitations written into the LMC in terms of how the HPB can participate, he came up with a number of items that he felt should be their Mission to accomplish as a Board. The first was to recognize the contribution of projects that compliment and perpetuate historic character. A second goal was to present a narrative to the community about the historic environs and enclaves that contribute to or present opportunity for sustenance of that which they envision themselves to be and want to preserve. A third goal was to encourage a dialogue on historic values and relevance. A final goal was to identify the merits of adaptive re-use.

Chair Durst requested discussion on an endorsement of the proposed mission. If they want to go outside of what he considers to be a limited review of projects within the Historic Districts and try to create a greater awareness within the community of historic values, they need to establish ways to accomplish that.

Board Member Werbelow asked if the discussion was specific to the Design Review Team representative. Chair Durst recalled that the City Council had suggested two outreach opportunities. The first was the opportunity to have a representative from the HPB present during Design Review Team meetings. The second was to have a representative at Planning Commission meetings. Chair Durst recalled from a previous meeting that the Board had discussed rotating representative from the HPB who would attend the Planning Commission meetings on a bi-monthly basis and report back to the HPB members on items that might impact the historic essence of Park City.

Regarding the DRT, Chair Durst recalled that a permanent appointee from the HPB would sit in on the deliberations of the Design Review Team and report back to the Board with possible suggestions on how the HPB might impact that design review.

City Council Member, Liza Simpson, felt that Chair Durst had accurately presented the two opportunities. With regards to attendance at the Planning Commission, she did not believe the City Council intended for an HPB liaison to attend every meeting. The intent was to provide the HPB with copies of the agenda so a representative could attend if a specific item would be of interest to the HPB. In addition, having a representative present allows the Planning Commission to ask for clarity on a specific matter.

With regard to the Design Review Team, Council Member Simpson clarified that the City Council had suggested that the HPB choose a representative to sit in at DRT meetings for a trial period, to see whether direct involvement from the HPB might be effective or ineffective.

Chair Durst agreed that having a representative sit with the DRT was a trial, however, he felt that involvement was critical to their function as a Board.

Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that minutes from the joint meeting with the City Council were distributed in June and were included in the Staff report. Ms. McLean recalled from the discussion at the last meeting, that starting in January, they would add the HPB to the email that is sent out each week or whenever a Design Review Team meeting is scheduled. She stated that the Planning Department could also provide the HPB with the Planning Commission agenda, however, she questioned whether that was necessary since the agenda is widely available. She noted that the Board members could sign up on the website to automatically receive a notification with the link as soon as the agenda is published. Ms. McLean suggested that procedure as the best means to obtain the agenda.

Assistant City Attorney McLean agreed with the idea of a trial period on the DRT. She reiterated her previous concern with having a representative from the HPB sit on the DRT, in terms of the issue of recusal and conflict in the event of an appeal.

Director Eddington understood the appeal concern and suggested that if the three month trial basis was successful, he would suggest that the person chosen for the DRT stay for the remaining nine months for a full year term. That would make it easier for the Staff to identify which Board member needed to be recused if a project goes to the HPB on appeal.

Council Member Simpson assumed the Legal Department would do legal training on what the DRT representative should be reporting back to the HPB. She also recalled from the discussion that the HPB member would only observe during the trial period rather than participate in the design review discussion.

Assistant City Attorney McLean envisioned the process as a liaison role. That person would only observe unless there is a specific question related to the HPB. It would be inappropriate for the HPB representative to be involved with design issues. Ms. McLean pointed out that under the current DRT process, the Staff member makes the final decision. It is not a formal meeting with votes or action and it does not have to

meet the requirements of the Open and Public Meetings Act. Ms. McLean stressed the importance of keeping Design Review a more informal process.

Board Member Werbelow thought the original concept for having a representative sit on the DRT, was to offer the Staff and/or the applicant additional enhancement from an aesthetic standpoint and to bring something to the table. She saw this position as more than just a liaison role. Board Member Martz stated that he also thought it was more than a liaison role. His thinking was more towards resources and offering input on grants and tax incentives that could be utilized.

City Council Member Simpson commented on the need for balance. The HPB is a historic preservation board and not a design review body. The goal is for the HPB to bring resources to the table at the design review level to further historic preservation. The HPB should use the trial period to determine the best way to structure that process.

Director Eddington provided an explanation of the DRT process that was initiated as part of the new guidelines, and what the review entails. He explained that an applicant comes to the DRT for direction to help them meet the guidelines for that particular site. The applicant works with the planner and then completes an application for a formal HDDR, Historic District Design Review. At that point the planner compares the application with the DRT and determines whether they are on the right track and can move forward. If the plan is significantly different, another DRT may be required.

Board Member Martz suggested that the representative be an observer during the trial period to assess whether it is effective. The HPB could have a formal review, at which time the representative could provide input on whether the role needed to be upgraded. City Council Member Simpson was comfortable with that suggestion as a first step. She pointed out that the downside to choosing a design professional as the liaison, is that he may have to recuse himself from the DRT if he is the project designer. Board Member Martz remarked that if the Chair is the liaison, that would also create a problem in an appeal situation because he would have to recuse himself. He asked if the liaison would need to be recused from an appeal if they only sat with the DRT to observe. Assistant City Attorney McLean replied that they would need to be recused because they were still part of the DRT process and heard the discussion.

Chair Durst stated that when he raised the issue of having a representative sit with the DRT, he never intended for that person to be an actual member of the design review team. However, because of his experiences with the DRT, he felt it was important to understand how the process was working. Chair Durst remarked that preservation and design are interfaced and there is no distinction between the two. He suggested that the liaison from the HPB should have the ability to express an opinion to the DRT if it is within their responsibility to the Historic Preservation Board. Chair Durst pointed out that the DRT does not take a formal vote and the decision is made by consensus. Recommendations are made to the applicant and the design is either approved or denied. If the design is approved, it does not come before the HPB. If the design is denied by the DRT, the applicant has the opportunity to change the design or appeal the decision to the HPB. Chair Durst believed that the liaison should not be a participant with Staff in making the decision, however, he or she should be allowed make a comment with regard to how the design impacts preservation.

Chair Durst remarked that the integration of design and preservation is critical and he thought it was important for the HPB to hear feedback from the representative regarding the factors that were taken into consideration.

Director Eddington asked if Chair Durst was suggesting that the representative report on general issues that were discussed during the design review, without commenting on the project specifically, or if he was talking about making comment on the issues during the time of appeal. Chair Durst clarified that if a project came before the HPB on appeal, the representative to the DRT would have to recuse himself without discussion.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that the appeals do not always come from the applicant. If the project is approved and a neighbor objects, the neighbor could bring it back on appeal. Ms. McLean stated that the representative would be walking a fine line between presenting general issues to the HPB and providing specific information on a project. Once they get into specifics, it taints the entire Board for an appeal. Her understanding from the joint meeting with City Council was that the HPB is still tasked with being the appeal board and they need to be careful.

Board Member McFawn saw the liaison role as being more process oriented. That person could report on what occurred in the process. He would not want to hear specifics in a report from the liaison, because a project could be appealed several months later and all the Board members would need to be recused. Board Member McFawn thought the trial period should be three months and the Board members should determine a time frame for reports to the HPB. Director Eddington suggested that the liaison provide a comprehensive report after the trial period.

Chair Durst asked if the trial period should be six months. Board Member McFawn thought six months may be too long. He was more comfortable with a three month trial. Board Member White thought a report once a week after each DRT meeting would be too much, but suggested that a report at each Board meeting might be appropriate. Director Eddington noted that the DRT averages two meetings per month, and that can vary based on the number of applications. He commented on the variety of projects in different applications and suggested that reporting every three months would provide a wider perspective of the discussions.

Board Member Werbelow agreed that six months was too long, since the point of sharing information with the HPB is to help the Board broaden its understanding of the process. She did not believe that reporting at each meeting was too often, noting that if it is only one or two issues the update would be brief. More frequent reporting would make it easier for the Board to keep current with the discussions.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the decision was ultimately up to the HPB. She recommended that they leave it to the discretion of the representative to decide when it is appropriate to update the HPB.

Board Member McFawn stated that he was leaning towards more of a passive/observe/report type of liaison position. He did not have enough knowledge of the process to say how much dialogue the liaison could contribute to the design review team in an active versus passive fashion.

Board Member Martz commented on various conflicts that could come out of the liaison role. He represented the HPB at Planning Commission meetings in the past, particularly for the design guidelines, and that was appropriate. However, if a representative from the HPB sits with the DRT on projects or matters that could come before the HPB, he was unsure which was more appropriate, active or passive.

Assistant City Attorney McLean felt Council Member Simpson could speak to that question since she serves in a similar role to the Planning Commission. Council Member Simpson remarked that if she correctly understood the goal for having the HPB represented on the DRT, as well as the joint meeting discussion, the HPB representative would attend DRT meetings as a resource to help interpret the Historic Design Guidelines and explain the intent behind a guideline. The HPB liaison would not impart their personal ideas as to what would make a better design.

Board Member Martz stated that he has attended several of the Treasure meetings to listen, but he believed it would be inappropriate for him to make comment. Council Member Simpson remarked that Board Member Martz made the right decision, because if the Treasure project would somehow come to the HPB on appeal, having spoken at one of those meetings would give him public standing to be an appellant and he would have to recuse himself.

Chair Durst recommended that the HPB begin slowly with an observation role through a test period of three or four months. He would like to bring the DRT process back to the Board for discussion on how it correlates with their responsibility. Chair Durst thought it would be inappropriate for the HPB representative to comment directly to the applicant.

Board Member Werbelow pointed out that the current design guidelines are more fluid and have the ability to be changed if necessary. She felt that was another reason why it would be beneficial for the Board as a whole to hear reports over a three or four month time period, to see if there are repetitive issues that indicate areas in the guidelines that need to be refined or corrected. Board Member Werbelow believed the process could be beneficial for the entire community.

Chair Durst requested a volunteer to initiate the process of appointment. Secondly, if the HPB votes to move forward, they should draft a document outlining the intent of the process to be submitted to the City Council. Board Member McFawn suggested that the document be specific in terms of the role of the liaison, their responsibilities, and the expectations.

Board Member Martz recommended appointing an alternate for both the DRT and the Planning Commission. Director Eddington cautioned that within a three month trial, if two Board members attend, it could take two members away from the appeal process. Board Member McFawn did not favor an alternate for the DRT.

Director Eddington suggested that the DRT representative begin in January for a three month trial period. He noted that the DRT meets on Wednesday at 11:00 and the meetings last about an hour. The DRT meets every other week on average, but that varies based on applications.

Chair Durst turned the discussion to the role of Planning Commission liaison. He noted that the Planning Commission meets twice a month and historic projects are not

discussed at every meeting. He suggested that Director Eddington send him the agenda prior to each Planning Commission meeting so he could evaluate whether or not an item on the agenda would affect the Historic Preservation Board. If he felt it was necessary for the HPB to be represented, he would randomly call the Board members until he found someone to represent them at that particular meeting. The person who attends would report back to the HPB.

Board Member Werbelow asked if the person attending the Planning Commission meeting would be there for representation or observation. Council Member Simpson thought it would be beneficial if each of the Board members attended a Planning Commission meeting to familiarize themselves with the language and the process. Director Eddington agreed. He also suggested that the Staff could bring a steep slope CUP within the historic district to the HPB, so they could see what the Planning Commission discussed and what role the HPB would have played if a representative had attended.

Board Member McFawn pointed out that the Planning Commission meetings are open to the public and each Board member is part of the public at large. They are all free to attend a public meeting and not have to recuse themselves. He did not believe it was necessary to appoint a formal liaison at this point, because they all have the ability to read the minutes on the website or attend the meetings.

Council Member Simpson commented on the benefit of the HPB being a communication resource once they are more comfortable with the Planning Commission process. At that point, she would encourage appointing a liaison to the Planning Commission. Board Member Martz stated that he has attended many Planning Commission meetings and knows the process. He did not believe the HPB members needed to be part of the public process. If they are attending for a specific purpose, there should be some level of having a seat at the table.

Assistant City Attorney McLean clarified that from a Code perspective and a matter of definition of "seat at the table", if the Planning Commission knows that an HPB member is present, they will call them to the table for input on a specific issue. Council Member Simpson believed that recognition was one reason for having one appointee attend the meetings as the liaison. Council Member Simpson explained that the liaison to the Planning Commission would not need to recuse himself if an item came to the HPB on appeal. As the City Council liaison to the Planning Commission, when a Planning Commission appeal comes to the City Council, she does not have to recuse herself. That was the reason for keeping the resource and informational role separate from the policy role.

Chair Durst requested that Director Eddington send the Planning Commission agenda to all of the Board Members. If a Board Member sees a correlation between the responsibility of the HPB and an issue scheduled before the Planning Commission, they should let Director Eddington know that they would attend as the liaison, and also inform Chair Durst.

Assistant City Attorney McLean recommended that the HPB appoint one liaison and an alternate, so the Planning Commission recognizes a constant face. Council Member Simpson suggested that the Board Members get the agenda from the City website rather than having Director Eddington send it out. Director Eddington noted that the Planning

Commission meets the second and fourth Wednesday of every month at 5:30 p.m. Council Member Simpson commented on the length of Planning Commission meetings and stated that it would not be inappropriate for the HPB representative to leave once the items pertinent to the HPB have been addressed.

Chair Durst asked if there was consensus among the Board members to initiate these liaison positions in an effort to develop a better understanding of the role they are called upon to fill. The Board concurred. Chair Durst asked Council Member Simpson if she had enough information to report their intent to the City Council. Council Member Simpson answered yes. When specific representatives are appointed, she would also take that information to the City Council. She explained that the decision was up to the HPB and they would not need approval from the City Council.

Director Eddington asked if the HPB was prepared to move forward this evening, or if they preferred to wait until December to select both the DRT and Planning Commission representatives.

Board Member Werbelow preferred to wait. She was interested in the DRT position, but needed time to check her professional schedule to see if she was able to meet the commitment.

Board Member McFawn was interested in the Planning Commission liaison and he also needed to make sure he could make the time commitment. He planned to informally attend the next Planning Commission meeting to get a better understanding.

Board Member Martz was also interested in being a liaison or an alternate.

Council Member Simpson noted that if the HPB voted on the appointment at their first meeting in January, it would be early enough in the month that they would not miss any Planning Commission or DRT meetings. Chair Durst clarified that the Board would postpone an appointment until the meeting on January 5, 2011. The Board concurred.

Board Member McFawn thought it made sense to have one appointee for a certain period of time for both the DRT and the Planning Commission, rather than rotating members. However, he asked if it was possible for a Board member to sit in on one of the DRT meetings in advance of formally selecting someone, to make sure they have an interest before accepting the responsibility. Council Member Simpson felt it would be better for interested Board members to meet with Director Eddington on a one-on-one basis to discuss the process and how it works. Having individual Board members attend a Planning Commission meeting was different because it is a public process.

As previously suggested by Director Eddington, Board Member McFawn thought it would be helpful if the Staff could bring a few items to the HPB, where it would have been beneficial to have a liaison attend the Planning Commission meeting.

#### Historic Preservation Article in Park Record

Chair Durst stated that he had written an article regarding the venue he calls Miner's Village, along Deer Valley Drive, which is a punctuation between the more contemporary mountain rustic development in Deer Valley and the City itself. He had previously shared his article with the Board members and also reviewed it with Gary Kimball and

Dave Hampshire at the Park Record. Chair Durst remarked that the intent of the article was to get people thinking. He was happy to publish it from him alone, however, he preferred to present the article as a representative of the Historic Preservation Board.

Chair Durst thought the Board members were too apologetic about their lack of design sense. He has personally learned about the fabric of the town from Gary Kimball and Puggy Holmgren, and how they sense its historic perspective. In his opinion, if someone wants to be on the Historic Preservation Board, they obviously have a concern about the historic presence of the town. Chair Durst felt this article was an opportunity for the Board to express their own ideas.

Chair Durst requested that the Board members permit him to present the article to the Park Record for publication as a representative of the HPB, and for the Board to continue with future articles on a regular basis, so the community can sense that the HPB is a body that protects, preserves and sustains the historic legacy in Park City.

Board Member Werbelow liked the idea and felt it went towards marketing, economic aspects and other positive things related to historic preservation. She is a history major and she would be interested in writing an article for the Board to consider in the near future. Board Member Werbelow supported the idea and felt it was good for the HPB to be more vocal in the public so people can get a better sense of what the HPB does. They spend a lot of time and effort on the process and the community should be aware that their motive is to encourage historic preservation.

Board Member Werbelow did not understand the last line in the article. It is an important piece of property that people should be aware of, but she did not think Chair Durst was clear in his conclusion of what should be done with that property.

Chair Durst clarified that his intent was that the location is precious and eventually someone will try to develop it. If that were to occur, the Planning Department should consider that a significant portion of the property is important to preserve. Currently it is outside of the historic district and has less protection. He requested that the Planning Department acknowledge its importance and keep the ambiance they are rapidly losing in that area. If that ambiance is not protected by a complimentary, compatible design, the result will be a stream of condominium units from Deer Valley all the way down. Chair Durst clarified that he was not opposed to mountain rustic, although he had reservations about some of the designs that were approved along Deer Valley Drive. There is a scale that needs to be protected and he believes the existing cluster of homes can be preserved. Chair Durst thought it was important for the City to go on record as saying that they welcome developers, but with the understanding that some things need to be protected.

Council Member Simpson noted that the cluster of homes Chair Durst referred to were on the HSI, so they were not completely unprotected.

Board Member McFawn thought some of the points that should be highlighted in the article are specific homes the Board Members like to see as they drive along Deer Valley Drive. He suggested that the article indicate why these homes are important to the Board, but that the HPB is restricted because it is BLM land. He pointed out that the homes may be on the list, but as soon as someone purchases that property from the

BLM, it will be their property. Board Member McFawn thought that raising that type of awareness may help the public feel empowered to help and get involved.

Board Member Martz suggested that the article provide some history on the area and the houses, and possibly include a photo. This would provide a little more interest on the historical side. He also thought adding history about the Claim Jumper Building would also be beneficial.

Council Member Simpson questioned whether the Museum would pay to run the article in the newspaper and asked if Chair Durst has spoken with them. Chair Durst replied that he had only spoken with David Hampshire from the Park Record. Council Member Simpson offered to speak with Nan.

Chair Durst appreciated the comments from the Board. He would work on the suggested changes and bring it back to the Board for their review.

Council Member Simpson stated that if the Board's focus is on buildings that might be lost, such as the Claim Jumper, and if they could come up with the framework and frequency of articles, that would help in her discussion with Nan. The suggestion was made for a quarterly basis. Council Member Simpson remarked that if the focus is on distressed properties or ones they might lose, she suggested that the writer bring the article to the full Board, in case something is phrased a certain way that could offend someone and put the building at further risk.

Board Member Guyer was hesitant to pigeon-hole all the articles to only address distressed properties. He thought people might also be interested in hearing more general comments about preservation and what the HPB actually does. He felt there was value to publicizing their work and ultimate goal.

Council Member Simpson reminded the Board members that a City newsletter is sent out in a general mailing and it is an inexpensive way to communicate with the public.

Board Member McFawn asked if it was possible for the Board to encourage the Chamber of Commerce or other organizations to use homes that have been preserved per historic recommendations in their literature. This would instill a sense of pride in ownership and inspire people to upgrade their homes from significant to landmark status.

Chair Durst stated that in October he had the opportunity to take 20 architects from the Western Region on a walking tour down Main Street. They were very complimentary of the adaptive re-use of Zooms and Easy Street.

### Awards

Chair Durst commented on awards, which is another outreach that the HPB had previously discussed. Board Member Werbelow noted that the HPB had talked about additional ways for the HPB as a body to reward residential or commercial property owners for their preservation efforts. She recalled that the Board unanimously favored the idea of an awards program and created a subcommittee with her, Roger and David. Director Eddington had facilitated a discussion with the subcommittee, where they established some criteria suggestions. Board Member Werbelow reported that progress

was made and the goal was to take this concept to the City Council the first of the year. Based on the subcommittee discussion, Director Eddington was prepared to present three or four potential criteria. It was unclear whether the criteria would be consistent from year to year, or whether it would be an evolving set of criteria for analysis. She pointed out that the intent is not to interfere with the Historic Society awards program. This award would pinpoint other aspects of preservation.

Director Eddington stated that the subcommittee met and tried to determine whether they wanted to come up with strict criteria and parameters, or whether they wanted the HPB award to be more encompassing. The subcommittee preferred to have something more encompassing that ties the award with historic preservation as well as the economic resort component of the town. He offered generic suggestions for project criteria: 1) It meets the historic preservation goals of the HPB 2); it adheres to the historic district design guidelines; 3) it relates well to the surrounding neighborhood and ties into the historic fabric; 4) it has an economic relation to the community. Director Eddington asked if the HPB was comfortable with that type of loose criteria, or if they preferred to have bullet point criteria driven by the design guidelines.

Board Member Martz pointed out that some of the projects went from the old guidelines to the new guidelines, and for that reason the criteria needed to be flexible. He favored a broader approach. Board Member Werbelow stated that the subcommittee went through a project exercise and determined that the guidelines should be a component, but it was important for the criteria to take into consideration a well-rounded analysis of the property. She suggested that the subcommittee could come to the next meeting with a suggested property to be rewarded with this first award. Prior to that meeting she requested that other Board members contact the subcommittee with any suggested properties they believe meets the criteria and why. The Board can then discuss the properties, vote on one and present it to the City Council.

Council Member Simpson recommended that the Board incorporate the language taken from the community visioning as they discuss the loose framework. She noted that the City Staff and the City Council are using that language in the way it was intended to be used, as a filter or backbone to how decisions are made. The HPB award is a large part of what visioning was all about.

Chair Durst stated that he had a copy of the visioning graphic and he found it interesting. Director Eddington offered to email a copy of the graphic to each of the Board members. He stated that the Staff intends to bring the HPB into the General Plan discussions and community visioning is the foundation being used for those discussions. Director Eddington suggested that the HPB dedicate a future meeting to discuss the General Plan and the role the Historic Preservation Board would have in the process.

Board Member Werbelow stated that because they only had one meeting left before the end of the year, she was anxious to move the concept of the awards program to the next step. She was interested in receiving the graphic fairly soon so the subcommittee could define the mission statement for this awards program prior to the next meeting. Director Eddington stated that he would send the Board members the graphic, as well as a draft that included his notes, for discussion at the next meeting.

Council Member Simpson wanted to know why the City Council would need to give approval. She was told that there may be a budget issue with purchasing the plaque.

Director Eddington believed the plaque could be covered under the Planning Department. Council Member Simpson noted that the City Council is doing their visioning the first week in February. She suggested that the HPB provide a short update to the City Council during that process. Council Member Simpson reiterated that the HPB did not need City Council approval. During the joint meeting, the City Council encouraged the HPB to move forward with their ideas for outreach.

Board Member McFawn stated that during their City walking tour he thought he saw a building was being torn down, only to realize later that it was being preserved. He felt communication was important and suggested some type of signage in front of a building to let people know that the project has gone through the review process and there is no need for concern. Board Member White favored that idea. Council Member Simpson stated that this was a good example of the types of ideas that the HPB would present to the City Council if they choose to make a presentation during visioning. She pointed out that if the visioning timing does not work and the HPB moves forward with the award, they should still be able to schedule time during a City Council work session where the HPB could make their presentation.

Board Member Martz reported that in the 1990's, if a grant was awarded, a sign was posted on the property when the work commenced, to let people know that the building had received a grant. Director Eddington agreed that signage would be a good idea for various reasons and that the Staff would look into it.

The meeting adjourned at 6:49 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
Roger Durst, Chair  
Historic Preservation Board