

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF MAY 4, 2011

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Roger Durst, Ken Martz, David White, David McFawn, Sara Werbelow, Brian Guyer, Judy McKie

EX OFFICIO: Thomas Eddington, Kayla Sintz, Mark Harrington, Patricia Abdullah

ROLL CALL

Chair Durst called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

WORK SESSION

Update from Awards Program Subcommittee

Chair Durst stated that preliminary work was done regarding the potential for an awards program. The intent is to put the Historic Preservation Board in front of the public and to identify potential projects in town that contribute to the historic presence and character in the community.

Board Member Werbelow reported that the subcommittee met on several occasions and had compiled a suggested list of possible categories to recognize properties in town. The list was preliminary and it would continue to evolve. After the presentation to the HPB this evening, the City Council would be the next step, followed by a way to help the community understand what the HPB is trying to acknowledge and recognize.

Board Member Werbelow outlined the categories: 1) adaptive reuse and fill; 2) excellence in restoration; 3) sustainable preservation; 4) embodiment of historical context; 5) connectivity between building and landscape. Ms. Werbelow recalled that the HPB has previously discussed the adaptive reuse concept and awarding the first HPB award to the High West Property. High West was very excited when they were informed that the HPB wanted to acknowledge them this year with the first award.

Board Member Werbelow requested that the Board discuss the awards program this evening and hear direction from the Staff on how to move forward. They could then ask the City Council to endorse the program or create a resolution. The end result would be to present the award to the recipient at a specific event. She noted that the Historic Society has scheduled a gala in August and they have preliminarily expressed a willingness to work with the HPB to present the award to High West at that event.

Board Member Werbelow explained that for the actual award, the HPB would commission a one-of-a-kind art piece that would be hung in the Marsac Building to begin to create a legacy gallery. The recipient would receive a plaque.

Board Member Werbelow commented on the importance of bringing the guidelines into play to communicate some of the benefits of the guidelines to the community. The awards program is a good way for the community to have a visual of how the guidelines

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of May 4, 2011

can be translated into specific projects. Board Member Werbelow requested that the Board discuss the universal guidelines to see if anyone had a specific area of interest. This would help the HPB find projects to award in the future that fit within the guidelines.

Planner Kayla Sintz stated that in addition to the universal guidelines, Patricia Abdullah had included the National Historic Register guidelines. The definitions section under "Historic Integrity" listed the National Park Service guidelines, which are indicative of the landmark structures. There were different guidelines based on new construction and historic sites. The presentation this evening focused on the guidelines for historic sites, since the High West property was a National Register Site.

Planner Sintz read the universal guidelines for historic sites. Director Eddington stated that based on direction from a previous meeting, the idea was to utilize the universal guidelines to create a criteria sheet for the awards program that would embody the guidelines in a simplistic fashion. It would also allow the criteria to serve for all of the award categories.

Board Member Werbelow felt it was important for the Board members and the community to be able to interact with the guidelines; however, she did not want the program to be overly structured. Without some structure the award would appear arbitrary. The guidelines provided the necessary structure. Commissioner Werbelow remarked that the process did not need to be marked check boxes. When a project is awarded, there should be a sense of reaction and passionate excitement as opposed to just sticking to the guidelines.

Chair Durst stated that the subcommittee recommended High West as the first recipient of the award and he was prepared to move forward with the endorsement of the Board. He had looked into arranging to have a watercolor done of the building and a plaque would be awarded to the High West entity. He reiterated that the presentation would be made in conjunction with the Historic Society's gala. Chair Durst invited comments from others as they move forward. He understood from Director Eddington that resources may be available within the City to cover the cost of the plaque and the painting. Director Eddington stated that the Staff was looking into available resources. Chair Durst had contacted a local artist that he was familiar with in the area. He welcomed other ideas.

Board Member Martz favored broadening the base for things such as appropriate infill and adaptive reuse, and not just historic houses. He also favored defining the process for choosing the award. He has been through a similar process with the Historical Society and many preservation awards and certificates have been presented. He believed that broadening the base and having more specific criteria from the HPB was a good move forward. It adds credence to the HPB, as well as having the City recognize the contributions of specific people.

With so many artists in the community, Board Member McKie wanted to know how they would let the artists know about this opportunity and how they would choose an artist. Chair Durst clarified that he had solicited a price from an artist, but an artist had not been chosen. The price he was given was approximately \$600. Chair Durst did not believe it was necessary to commission the same artist every year, as the criteria for selection continues to change. Chair Durst stated that since adaptive re-use was the category for

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of May 4, 2011

the first award, he thought they should wait at least two years before that category is returned.

Board Member McKie suggested that they inform the community that the HPB is looking for an artist to commission a piece, and then wait to see what type of response comes back.

City Attorney Mark Harrington stated that in proceeding with this particular award, they should be clear about whether it is awarded by the HPB or the City Council. He assumed the City Council would be pleased to have it come from the HPB. However, a resolution from the City Council gives the award more proclamation and weight. Mr. Harrington recommended that the HPB check with the City Council to see if they could award it through their own resolution, or whether the HPB would like the formality of the City Council. He felt it was important for the Board to have that discussion.

Chair Durst asked if it would be appropriate for the HPB to make the choice and refer it to City Council for their action.

City Attorney Harrington replied that either way was appropriate. The HPB could keep it as its own program and adopt a resolution, or they could do it in conjunction with the City Council. Mr. Harrington advised the Board to formally vote on the property to be awarded, as opposed to just moving forward on the recommendation of the subcommittee.

Regarding artists, City Attorney Harrington noted that the City has a Public Art Committee, headed by Sharon Bauman. He suggested that they contact Ms. Bauman to avoid any conflicts and to keep the procurement process fair. Board Member Werbelow favored the idea of interacting with the Public Art Committee. Board Member White liked the suggestion of using a different artist each year or for each type of award. Board Member White noted that Scott Roberts is a local artist who has done historic structures in town for many years. He felt there were many local artists that could be considered. Chair Durst offered to contact Sharon Bauman to see if she could recommend a list of local artists who would meet their objective.

Assistant City Attorney pointed out that the HPB could not make a formal resolution this evening, since it was not noticed on the agenda as an action item. The agenda for this meeting specifically said no action. Planner Sintz asked the Board members about attendance if the next HPB meeting was scheduled for Wednesday, June 15th instead of June 1st.

Chair Durst asked if it would be possible to schedule a short special meeting to adopt the resolution prior to June 15th. Board Member Werbelow remarked that the HPB could use the time to speak with Sharon Bauman and be prepared for a resolution at the regular meeting on June 15th. The Board concurred. Board Member Werbelow asked if there was any objection among the Board for moving forward with High West. There were no objections. She would confirm with Sandra Morrison regarding participation with the historic society gala.

Planner Sintz summarized that the June 15th Staff report would outline the guidelines, as well as the different criteria, and have an attached resolution. Chair Durst asked if the

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of May 4, 2011

HPB could choose an artist prior to June 15th, or if it needed to be a formal vote by the Board. City Attorney Harrington believed the Public Art Committee had its own rules for selection and advertising. He stated that the Board had the option to either work with the Art Committee through their process, or comply with the requirements of the City Procurement Policy. Mr. Harrington explained that any action by the HPB must be done by an agenda vote. However, they could do all the preliminary work prior to a formal vote on June 15th.

Board Member McFawn asked if the award would have a name. Based on the discussion regarding delight, Planner Sintz felt it would be appropriate to have "historic delight" in the title. The theme could be different each year. Board Member Martz pointed out that if the recipient receives a plaque, it would be expensive to change the plaque each year.

Chair Durst encouraged each Board Member to submit ideas and suggestions to Board Member Werbelow for discussion and action on June 15th.

Creation of Subcommittee for McPolin Farm

Chair Durst stated that this item resulted from a conversation he had with Board member White. Neither of them had visited the barn and through the efforts of Denise Carey and Roger Evans they were able to tour the facility a month ago. From an architectural standpoint, Chair Durst found it to be a very intriguing building. It is an iconic part of the historic of Park City. He was unsure whether the barn had potential to become more available to the general public or the community. In his opinion, a conversion of the barn space itself would be a major undertaking and a significant expense. Chair Durst complimented the Friends of the Farm organization for the improvements and amenities they have accomplished, because it provides a comfortable space for small gatherings. Chair Durst observed that the exterior of the home is in good condition and the grounds are well kept. However, aside from the buildings, his concern is with the setting and the environment. He asked if the Historic Preservation Board would have a role in encouraging that the setting be kept the way it is, or whether the use could be expanded. Chair Durst had concerns about allowing additional pedestrian traffic beyond cross country skiers because it could destroy the very essence of the existing environment.

Chair Durst stated that one suggestion was to hire an American Gothic couple who could provide custodial service, similar to Williamsburg, Virginia. However, he was unsure if that would be appropriate for Park City. Chair Durst commented on the importance of sustaining the McPolin Farm based on its contribution to the historic fabric of town.

Chair Durst stated that he and Board Member White would give more thought to preserving the space, and he welcomed anyone else who was interested in looking into the potential of this fascinating place.

Board Member Martz provided some history of the area. He noted that the old Historic District Commission was involved in the original planning of the restoration of that particular area. The house itself is a reproduction of the original house and it was brought back to where it could be used. The shed was also a reproduction that was upgraded with facilities and can now be used for gatherings. The parking lot was added.

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of May 4, 2011

Board Member Martz agreed that it is a great facility for the community and it looks very much like the original. Some of the sheds are original.

Board Member Martz stated that Sandra Morrison had seen the McPolin Farm as an agenda item for this meeting and she provided some information. In 2003 the Historical Society received a grant from the National Historic Trust to have the barn assessed and surveyed by an engineering company, Richards Consulting Group, to see what the building needed. Upgrades were done, but based on comments by Ms. Morrison, Board Member Martz did not believe anything had been done since that time. In spite of the upgrades, a number of tie rods and other items that were suggested in 2003 still need to be replaced. He understood that if subject to a high wind, the building could collapse if it was not upgraded.

Board Member Martz presented a survey that he thought the HPB or Planning Department should review to see if the barn should be revisited in terms of continued preservation.

Director Eddington thought the suggestion to establish a subcommittee was a good idea. He noted that any suggestions from the subcommittee or the HPB would be in the form of a recommendation to the City Council as the owner of the barn.

Board Member McFawn liked the idea of a subcommittee, but he felt it should go beyond the McPolin barn. He preferred that it be a historic properties subcommittee that could address City-owned structures or properties that are deteriorating, and provide recommendations to the City Council. Board Member McFawn did not favor a subcommittee that would be static for one item. He suggested a year-round subcommittee that could pursue a new property on a quarterly basis.

Chair Durst suggested that the subcommittee plan an informal meeting to begin a discussion on historic properties that are outside of the private realm. He mentioned BLM property. Director Eddington thought the Spriggs barn was also an issue. Board Member Martz did not believe the Spriggs Barn was on the Historic Sites Inventory. Director Eddington offered to look into it.

City Attorney Harrington cautioned the Board to be aware of doing public work in subcommittees outside of the public view. Because of the amount of history on the McPolin Barn, Mr. Harrington believed a plan could already be in place. He suggested that they begin with a broader presentation from the Friends of the Farm, the Staff, or someone else who could put it in perspective. He recalled that most of the decisions were policy decisions rather than financial decisions. Finances have been a factor, but the debate has been more towards how much of the farm should be open to the public. Mr. Harrington pointed out that the Planning process was equally as complicated. There has been a series of bond and deed restrictions of a third party, as well as the conditional use permit process that allowed a certain number of events per year. Mr. Harrington stated that it was appropriate for the HPB to weigh in on changing the current policy or taking new steps, but the existing policies need to be considered in their discussion.

Chair Durst suggested that he and David White meet with the Friends of the Farm. As they move forward, they could include one additional Board member to brainstorm ideas.

Board Member McKie asked if there was a limit on the number of people who could be on a subcommittee. Assistant City Attorney stated that they cannot have more than three subcommittee members and they cannot have a meeting outside of a meeting, either electronically or through communications. They cannot have a debate with more than three. Mr. Harrington stated that in the past they tried to encourage boards to utilize subcommittees for the basis of efficiency on technical matters that do not merit the attention of the entire board. The subcommittee researches and brainstorms and provides a report to their Board or Commission. The update is scheduled on the agenda and everyone hears the report.

Board Member McKie clarified that the recommendation was to keep the subcommittee to three members. City Attorney Harrington replied that his advice would be no more than three.

Board Member White asked if the City had documentation on how the barn was originally constructed. Chair Durst stated that after he visited the site, he was able to obtain a plat of the work that was done to enhance the access, parking lot and other improvements. The Building Department was unable to locate any other documentation. Board Member White noted that the existing cables make the structure unusable. He thought it would be helpful to find out how the barn was originally braced. Chair Durst believed the cabling stabilized the barn, however, it rendered the building uninhabitable.

Board Member Martz thought they should consider Mr. Harrington's comments about past history and consult with the groups involved, as well as with the City. Director Eddington stated that the Staff could begin to pull whatever information they could find from internal City sources. Planner Sintz stated that she would invite someone from Friends of the Farms, as well as someone from the City staff, to attend the June 15th meeting and update the Board.

Historic Preservation Seminar

Chair Durst reported on a seminar he had attended in New York City. It attracted his interest because the primary topic was green design vs. historic preservation. The intended outline of the course included the identification of sustainable design principles in conflict with historic preservation guidelines; and analyzing conflicting areas between sustainability and historic preservation. Chair Durst appreciated the opportunity to attend the seminar, although in hindsight he would not have gone because the presentation was abysmally poor.

Chair Durst stated that the premise of the presentation was that global warming is no longer a scientific guess and it creates an emerging conflict between preservation purists and new-age environmentalist. The challenge was adjoining historic preservation with sustainable guidelines. Chair Durst provided a summary of the presentation.

Chair Durst commented on sustainability and what the City Council has been discussing in terms of sustainability, keeping the community green and being efficient with energy resources. With higher energy costs, he felt it is necessary to promote sustainability; otherwise the existing structures would become uneconomical.

Director Eddington recalled that the Utah Heritage Foundation talked about the green benefit of preserving buildings rather than tearing them down, and to reuse certain materials to conserve energy. He reminded the Board that Thursday and Friday of the following week was the 2011 Utah Heritage Foundation Historic Preservation Conference.

Chair Durst felt the City should emphasize that tearing down a structure takes away the invested energy in the building and creates additional waste disposal.

City Attorney Harrington stated that as the Staff works with the Planning Commission to re-write the General Plan, it is important to overlap the various components of the General Plan and the priorities of preservation with sustainability to make sure the two do not conflict.

Next Visioning Session

Director Eddington stated that the HPB had their last visioning in February 2010. He requested that the Board discuss dates for another visioning. He noted that it would be an informal session over drinks and it would be noticed to the public. Chair Durst asked about the visioning information that Phyllis Robinson was compiling. Director Eddington replied that the visioning document was based on the core values and it was being used as the foundation for the General Plan. Director Eddington stated that one topic for the visioning session would be how to involve the HPB in some of the General Plan discussions.

Planner Sintz suggested that they align the dates for visioning with the timing of new Board members. Patricia stated that new Board members would be effective in July. Terms were up for Ken Martz, Roger Durst, and Judy McKie. Board Member Martz stated that he would not seek re-appointment.

Director Eddington suggested that they wait until July to schedule a visioning session. He suggested July 18th and 19th and asked the Board to tentatively leave those dates open.

Miscellaneous Business

Chair Durst reported that a session on Treasure Mountain was schedule for June 7th at Eccles. He encouraged all the Board members to attend if possible. Chair Durst believed that Treasure Mountain is critical to the historic district, regardless of how it is developed. It is immediately contiguous and its impact will be significant. He thought it was important for the Board to see what was being proposed.

Director Eddington noted that a similar presentation would be made to the Planning Commission at their meeting on June 8th.

Chair Durst asked if the HPB could discuss Treasure Hill and make a recommendation to the City Council. City Attorney Harrington stated that the broadest language allows the HPB to advise on zone changes, but it clearly states that CUPs and MPDs remain the decision of the Planning Commission. He cautioned the Board to be careful in their comments because they some things could potentially come before them for design

Historic Preservation Board
Minutes of May 4, 2011

review. Mr. Harrington stated that it would be appropriate for Board members to individually make comment to the City Council as residents and owners. Mr. Harrington clarified that the three scenarios were only status updates from the applicants on what they have put on the table. It was not anything the City has agreed to. He stated that Board members could provide input to the City Council on which scenario they favored, but he advised them to reserve judgment.

Chair Durst referred to the nine purpose statements for the HPB and the four additional duties. He reiterated that whatever happens with Treasure Hill is critical to the historic essence of the community. City Attorney Harrington pointed out that the purposes statements do not contemplate pending projects. He noted that the Treasure Hill application is currently on hold, and for that reason it is important to maintain some type of separateness. Mr. Harrington remarked that Item C was the closest because it talks about protection of the integrity of historic buildings and structures. From a policy level, if one solution on the table impacts the integrity of the district more than the others, it would be appropriate for Board members to provide comment. He cautioned them against doing anything prematurely, since the three scenarios were only updates at this point.

The meeting adjourned at 6:38 p.m.

Approved by: _____
Roger Durst
Historic Preservation Board