

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 18, 2015

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren,
Hope Melville, Douglas Stephens, Jack Hodgkins

EX OFFICIO: Bruce Erickson, Anya Grahn, Hannah Turpen, Mark Harrington,
Polly Samuels McLean, Louis Rodriguez

Planning Director, Bruce Erickson, noted that David White would not be attending this evening and that the Board needed to elect a Chair Pro Tem to conduct the meeting this evening.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren nominated Doug Stephens as Chair Pro Tem. Board Member Lola Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

MOTION: Board Member Stephens nominated Hope Melville as Chair Pro Tem. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

Director Erickson called for a vote on the motion to nominate Doug Stephens. Four Board members voted in favor of the motion.

Director Erickson called for a vote on the motion to nominate Hope Melville. Three Board members voted in favor of the motion.

Based on the vote, Director Erickson declared Doug Stephens as the Chair Pro Tem for the meeting this evening.

ROLL CALL

Chair Pro Tem Stephens called the meeting to order at 5:11 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Cheryl Hewett and David White who were excused.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

October 7, 2015

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to ADOPT the Minutes of October 7, 2015 as written. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
November 18, 2015

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

October 21, 2015

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to ADOPT the Minutes of October 21, 2015 as written. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

November 4, 2015

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to ADOPT the minutes of November 4, 2014 as written. Board Member Hodgkins seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Board member Beatlebrox was pleased that the summary document that she prepared reflected the bulleted points from the minutes of October 7 and October 21 that she thought was germane to their discussion. It was a checklist to track of what they had already discussed to help get consensus before they forward a recommendation.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens echoed the earlier comments by Director Erickson in expressing appreciation to Board Member Beatlebrox for her efforts in preparing the document.

Planner Grahn stated that if the Board Members had done what Director Erickson has requested at the last meeting and had walked around Old Town taking pictures, she would like those photos submitted to the Planning Department no later than next Wednesday so they could be organized in some form for the meeting on December 2nd. She requested that they put the address on the photos.

Planner Grahn noted that December 2nd would be the only HPB meeting in December.

Planner Grahn reported that she and Planner Turpen had missed the last HPB meeting because they were in Washington, DC for the National Trust Conference. She thought they came away with good ideas from some of the session they attended. Planner Grahn had attended a session that focused on interpretation of historic sites and how important it is to tell the complete story. One example was in the south where they should not only talk about the Civil

War, but they should also be putting up plaques for where slave trade occurred. She commented on ways they use technology over and above using apps.

Planner Turpen stated that during the conference she learned a lot about Main Street. Many other towns are having the same issues as Park City in terms of vacancy and maintaining character despite rising rents and development pressures. She noted that several larger city representatives spoke about it and they created initiatives because other cities are going through this. Planner Turpen provided a handout from the representative from San Francisco. She stated that San Francisco created a grant program for their local businesses to maintain their spaces because they were getting pushed out by higher rents. They also have a Legacy Bar of San Francisco, which is sponsored by their local non-profit.

Planner Turpen had also attended a session on modeling community engagement and creating important conversations with the public. She believed the information she learned would be helpful when they look at the Design Guidelines.

Director Erickson stated that the HPB would be meeting on December 2nd and January 6th. However, the pending ordinance continues in force up until February 1st and he requested that the Board members move forward with the pending ordinance to keep it on schedule. The City Council is tentatively scheduled to take action on the ordinance at the end of December or early in January. Director Erickson remarked that the Design Guidelines and the character zones are not directly linked to the pending ordinance and the Board could take additional time to discuss now.

Director Erickson reported that on November 11th the Planning Commission forwarded a positive recommendation to the City Council on the pending ordinance with minor changes. They made clarifications on how Contributory buildings are being treated, what regulations would occur, and other changes with respect to demolition. He noted that the HPB had already reviewed the majority of the changes.

Board Member Melville understood that the pending ordinance in the Staff report for this evening had been approved. Planner Grahn clarified that the Planning Commission had forwarded a positive recommendation.

Director Erickson outlined the City Council agenda for the following evening, which included a study session on the impacts of panelization and reconstruction; and a review of historic structures at 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue where the City was considering panelization as a means of preserving those two structures. At the regular meeting, he and Planner Grahn would be talking about managing construction in the Historic District and construction on historic

structures. Director Erickson pointed to a previous discussion on the requirement for a structure engineer to sign off on shoring and method of lifting historic structures for construction. If any changes occur, the structural engineer has to come back and re-certify the changes. Director Erickson stated that they were also modifying the terms of the conditional use permit for construction on steep slopes to add an additional condition of approval that would come from the Planning Commission restricting the amount of time a house could be raised to 60 days. Another change is to prohibit construction in the historic districts on steep slopes from October 15th to April 15th. Director Erickson stated that all of the above items were on the City Council agenda. For the following City Council meeting, the Council would be approving no-nightly rentals in the HR-L East Zone, which is the Ontario Avenue neighborhood.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens wanted to know what the Staff wanted from the HPB regarding the pending ordinance, since the Planning Commission had already forwarded their recommendation. Director Erickson replied that they would like a positive recommendation from the HPB as well. He explained that it was an amendment to the LMC, which is the responsibility of the Planning Commission. The HPB would be making a recommendation to the City Council to amend the LMC.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked if it was possible to reverse the order of the agenda to address the legislative issue first, followed by the awards ceremony; and devote the remainder of the time to talk about the Design Guideline revisions and the character zones.

Board Member Holmgren asked if 1450 and 1460 Park Avenue were the bungalows. She noted that those houses came before the HPB a while ago and the Board forwarded their recommendation to the City Council. She stated that the structures were in dreadful condition at that time, and she thought the City was very guilty of demolition by neglect in this case. Board Member Holmgren remarked that when this issue was previously addressed the HPB said that the lilac bushes, rose trees and apple trees must be saved at all cost because they are very old.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if it was the property that was originally intended to be the co-housing project. Director Erickson answered yes. Board Member Beatlebrox commented on the need for affordable housing and asked if there was any discussion about creating affordable housing at that site. Director Erickson stated that the affordable housing component had changed to a more traditional affordable housing product. He understood that the City intends to panelize and restore the two historic homes on site. Planner Grahn replied that panelization was not certain and she recommended that the Board members follow that discussion at the City Council meeting the following evening.

Board Member Melville remarked that whatever the City does is what others would expect to be able to do. If the City is allowed to do panelization, they would have to allow it for everyone else. Planner Grahn understood from the last City Council meeting that as the owner of those properties they were deciding whether or not they wanted to suggest panelizing. Since that City Council meeting several Council members toured the site so they could have a more robust discussion to make that determination.

City Attorney, Mark Harrington, clarified that the decision was not whether or not to panelize. It was whether to authorize the Staff project manager to apply just like everyone else. He thought there was some disagreement among the Staff as to whether or not that should or should not proceed given that different standards were incorporated in the past as other projects were put forth on that property. As the owner, should the Council authorize the Staff to proceed with an application. Mr. Harrington stated that it would not be appropriate for any of the Board Members to provide input at the City Council meeting because the application could come before them at a later date and they needed to preserve their objectivity and ability to hear it. The Board was welcome to attend the City Council meeting to hear the discussion, but he recommended that they avoid making comments on the record.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that under the pending ordinance any panelization would come before the HPB for the initial review. The City Council could also ask the HPB for their input on City-owned project. Therefore, it could come back to the Board in two different ways.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens pointed out that this discussion was not scheduled on the agenda this evening and he suggested that they move forward with the agenda items. He asked if the Board was willing to rearrange the agenda as he previously suggested.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to reverse the order of the agenda and address the legislative issues first. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. Legislative - Consideration of an ordinance amending the land management code section 15, chapter 11 and all historic zones to expand the historic sites inventory and require review by the historic preservation board of any demolition permit in a historic district and associated definitions in chapter 15-15. (Application PL-15-02895)

Planner Grahn assumed the Board had read the Staff report and understood the concepts that were proposed earlier in October. She requested that the HPB move through the document section by section and provide input.

Planner Grahn referred noted that the first change at the bottom of page 111 of the Staff report was basically expanding the purposes of the HPB to review and take action on demolition permit applications. She noted that the HPB has been doing this since the pending ordinance was passed in September.

The Board supported the proposed change.

Planner Grahn referred to page 113 and noted that they were changing the language of all the historic site designations to remove, "that it has achieved significance in the past 50 years". This change was being proposed for the Landmark designation to keep the language consistent throughout all of the designations.

The Board supported the proposed change.

Planner Grahn referred to page 114 and noted that the Staff had modified the criteria for a Significant site. Director Erickson clarified that the modification expands coverage from what the previous ordinance required for Significant sites. By eliminating "it's essential historical form" and some of the other criteria, more site could be listed as Significant.

Board Member Beatlebrox noticed from the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting that the Commissioners were concerned about the idea of Contributory. She had no concerns because it is a good idea to know what is in the 10 year lead-up to 50 years and to keep that in mind. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that she would vote for the Contributory site.

Planner Grahn asked if there were any comments regarding Significant sites before they moved on to Contributory. The Board supported the proposed change.

Board Member Melville referred to the comments regarding Contributory and assumed that since the Planning Commission had forwarded a positive recommendation that their concerns had been addressed.

Planner Grahn explained that Contributory Sites would not be listed on the Historic Sites Inventory unless the Historic Preservation Board approves a grant. If a property receives a grant or the owner voluntarily designates the property as Contributory, it would go on the HSI and the HPB would review the demolition permit. If the property did not receive grant money and it was not on the

Contributory list, the owner would be asked to document the site before demolishing it.

Assistant City Attorney McLean understood that if someone received a grant, a new requirement is to put a preservation easement on the property. In addition, within the Code they would basically be treated as if they were on the HSI in terms of demolition. Ms. McLean pointed out that an owner could not voluntarily put their property on the Significant list unless they meet the required criteria for Significant designation. She noted that someone could choose to abide by the rules, but there was no mechanism under the Contributory status to preserve the structure more than anything else that is not on the list. Planner Grahn replied that she was correct.

Chair Pro Tem asked about process if a site was placed on the Contributory list and the owner wanted a demolition permit. Planner Grahn stated that it would be approved through the Historic District Design Review process and it would not come before the HPB. Mr. Stephens asked if the Staff was comfortable going in that direction. Planner Grahn answered yes, and noted that it was based on the feedback they received from the Planning Commission. Mr. Stephens asked if the Staff would have the ability to bring an item to the HPB if they were uncomfortable making the decision. Ms. McLean stated that there is no statutory limitation or prohibition on demolishing items on the Contributory List, unless they were given a grant. Being Contributory allows the owner to obtain a grant, but there is no mechanism for the HPB to review differently than Staff.

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that another change was to broaden the definition of Significant to capture more of the older structures.

Board Member Melville asked for an explanation on the Staff policy for nominating a site to the inventory. Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the Staff report reflected the policy that the Planning Department or the owner are the only parties that have standing to nominate a structure to be added or removed from the HIS. However, the Staff wanted it clear that members from the Museum or members from the public could contact the Planning Department and request that houses be considered for the inventory. The Staff would review the request and determine whether or not to take it before the HPB for a Determination of Significance.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the structure could be of any age. Ms. McLean stated that in order to be Significant, the structure would either have to be 50 years old or of historical importance. Mr. Hodgkins understood that it would not include Contributory structures. Ms. McLean replied that he was correct.

Director Erickson provided an example of when a Contributory building might be considered. A member of the public could nominate a Contributory structure and

request that the Staff consider whether it would meet the criteria to be determined Significant and protected under the Significant designation. Mr. Erickson stated that in terms of the character neighborhood studies, Contributory buildings will be used as a more formal way of determining neighborhood compatibility in design reviews and in looking at the neighborhood character zones. Mr. Erickson believed it would help the Staff do a better job regulating the Historic Districts.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens commented on the policy where a third party could request that the Planning Department nominate a specific structure for listing on the Sites Inventory. He could not recall how the property owner was involved. Ms. McLean stated that the property owner could request that their structure be considered for Determination of Significance. Mr. Stephens asked whether the LMC addresses that issue. He felt that if a third party has the right to bring this to the Planning Department, the owner should be brought into the administrative discussion at the same time. Planner Grahm stated that when the City was looking at adding additional sites to the HSI in the Spring, once the property was reviewed and a date was scheduled for Determination of Significance before the HPB, the property owners of those specific sites were notified through mail and email and they had the opportunity to discuss it with the Staff. Mr. Stephens clarified that his thinking was to involve the owner in the administrative process at the beginning to possibly educate the owner on the benefits and value of having the designation of Significance. He thought it was unfair to bring in the owner after an action had already been decided. Planner Grahm was willing to look at how they could notify the owner earlier in the process. Mr. Stephens understood the noticing process, and it was more a matter of promoting goodwill.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff would do their best to establish a policy for immediately notifying the owner when their property has been requested for nomination. He thought Mr. Stephens had made a good point.

Planner Grahm referred to page 116, the relocation and/or reorientation/disassembly and reassembly and reconstruction. The proposed change would be for relocation and reorientation requests to come before the HPB for approval, rather than being approved by the Planning Department through the HDDR process. However, the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official would still weigh in on the decision. The Staff had also outlined potentially unique conditions that could warrant relocating or re-orienting buildings on different sites.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the proposed change was logical. Board Member Melville agreed that it was important because it would relocation and reorientation significantly affects historic structures. Mr. Erickson pointed out that it also affects the character of the neighborhood. That was the reason for being overly-protective and having it reviewed by the HPB.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens commented on situations where relocation or reorientation would be appropriate. He wanted to make sure that the criteria allowed flexibility for those circumstances to occur. Assistant City Attorney McLean noted that there is language in the Code that identifies unique conditions in relation to reconstruction. The Staff had talked internally about better defining unique conditions for reorientation. Planner Grahn recalled that the Staff had discussed defining unique conditions for panelizations and disassemblies. Ms. McLean stated that “unique conditions” was a nebulous term and she recommended that the Staff should define it for clarity so an owner would know the expectations for their property.

Planner Grahn referred to the next section on pages 116 and 117 of the Staff report, disassembly/reassembly, which is panelization. Once again the change would remove the role from the Planning Department and require review and approval by the HPB. Another significant change was that prior to the pending ordinance the language said, “A licensed structural engineer had certified historic building and/or structures could not reasonably be removed intact or...”. She noted that the change would be to replace **or** with **and**. They would like a structural engineer’s opinion on all building that are being proposed to be panelized.

Board Member Melville asked if the applicant hires the structural engineer. Planner Grahn answered yes. Ms. Melville asked if anyone else would verify the engineer’s report. Planner Grahn stated that the Building Department, the Chief Building Official, the Planning Director, and the planner would all read the substance of the report. Planner Turpen noted that the report is stamped by a licensed certified structural engineer and it is truthful in the sense that it is produced by a professional in the field. Ms. Melville pointed out that engineer would still be hired by the applicant. Director Erickson did not believe there was a problem with the accuracy of reports from engineers hired by the applicants because their license is on the line. In addition, the Chief Building Official is good at looking for holes in these reports.

Planner Grahn noted that unique conditions for panelizations may include any three of the following: 1) if the site itself is problematic or the structural conditions preclude temporarily lifting or moving the building as a single unit; 2) if the physical conditions of the existing materials prevent temporarily lifting or moving a building and the applicant has demonstrated that panelization will result in the preservation of a greater amount of historic materials; 3) all other alternatives have been shown to result in additional damage or loss of historic materials.

The Staff would work with Assistant City Attorney McLean to make sure the language was correct and could be codified.

Board Member Melville wanted to know the criteria for reinforcing the building on the inside before it is moved. Planner Grahn stated that it was something that the Staff prefers that the applicant do, but they did not necessarily want it codified. If they can build a stud wall or bracing when the house is lifted, that would be preferable to panelizing. The problem is that some of the structures suffered such severe fire damage that poking a nail in the wood means the nail can go all the way through. They have to be cognizant of those situations as well. Chair Pro Tem Stephens believed that was covered under the third criteria. Planner Grahn stated that they try to discourage panelization as much as possible, but they still have to recognize that it is a form of preservation and sometimes it is necessary due to the historic fabric of the structure. Mr. Erickson noted that the bracing Ms. Melville mentioned becomes part of the preservation Plan that he and the Chief Building Official signs off based on the engineer's report.

Planner Grahn stated that Part B was again changing Planning Department to Historic Preservation Board.

Planner Grahn stated that for the reconstruction section, the language was changed to say that the Historic Preservation Board has to make that determination and not the Planning Department. She provided an example of when what would be considered reconstruction. If a house is in such poor condition it could not be panelized and the most they could do would be to salvage some historic materials that would be a reconstruction because they would be completely rebuilding the historic shape and using whatever historic materials were salvaged.

Assistant City Attorney McLean reminded the Board that these were the criteria that the HPB would be applying to applications if the Code changes are approved by the City Council. The Board needs to feel comfortable that the criteria is clear enough to help with their review.

Planner Grahn referred to the definitions on page 118 of the Staff report. She noted that the Staff had defined visual compatibility and what contributing means. They altered the definitions for demolition, demolish, and density, and also added to new definitions, which are continuity, rhythm and pattern.

Mr. Beatlebrox understood that they had not codified "vernacular" in the Guidelines; however, if they move towards the direction of defining neighborhood vernaculars she thought it should be referenced in the definitions. Planner Grahn stated that if the Board felt that it needed to be codified and that the definition of vernacular architecture is not sufficient just being in the Guidelines, they could discuss it when they discuss the Design Guidelines. Director Erickson stated that the Staff was working on drafting another round of LMC changes for the historic district that he anticipated would be presented the first quarter of 2016.

Planner Grahn referred to page 119 of the Staff report which talked about noticing for demolitions and designations. The Staff report outlined the noticing process for HDDR applications, as well as noticing for Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition. Planner Grahn stated that when the HPB has to conduct a demolition review, it would be noticed the same as the HDDR applications. The property would be posted 14 days in advance and a courtesy notice would be mailed to the neighbors 14 days in advance.

Planner Grahn stated that currently noticing for a Determination of Significance only requires that a sign be posted on the property for seven day. The Staff was proposing to change that to 14 days and to also add a courtesy mailing notice to alert the neighbors.

Planner Grahn referred to page 121 and noted that both the HPB and the Planning Commission had requested a demolition review checklist. Items a) through f) were what the Staff was proposing.

The Board was comfortable with what was proposed.

Unless the Board had further concerns, Planner Grahn requested that the HPB make a motion to forward a positive recommendation to the City Council regarding the LMC changes.

Assistant City Attorney noted that during the Planning Commission meeting it was decided that since the HPB would be reviewing items that the Staff has reviewed in the past and the HPB had acted as the appeal body, that there needed to be an appeal body for HPB decisions. The Staff had recommended the Board of Adjustment since the Board of Adjustment currently hears HPB appeals on Determinations of Significance. Ms. McLean pointed out that there was not language to that effect in the redlines.

Director Erickson stated that if the HPB chooses to make a positive recommendation to the City Council, the recommendation should include adding notice to property owners upon request that a property be nominated for Significance. Ms. McLean questioned whether that should be codified. Mr. Erickson preferred to include it in the recommendation and let the Staff sort it out.

Director Erickson noted that the recommendation should also include that the appeal body for a determination of the HPB is heard by the Board of Adjustment.

Assistant City Attorney McLean pointed out that the pending ordinance attached to the Staff report as Exhibit A was the old pending ordinance. That was done intentionally. The Staff had not added what was in the body of the Staff report to the end because this would be the first time the City Council would review it, and

they wanted to make sure that the protection of the pending ordinance changes based on the ordinance changes. The Staff wanted the pending ordinance to remain as broad as possible until the City Council could look at it, and at the same time have the input on the other changes. Ms. McLean stated that the HPB should forward the pending ordinance with a positive recommendation, and have the City Council consider their input on the items within the Staff report.

MOTION: Board Member Melville moved to forward a POSITIVE recommendation to the City Council regarding the proposed Land Management Code changes as presented in the Staff report dated November 18, 2015 with the following conditions: 1) That the appeal of the HPB determinations goes to the Board of Adjustment; 2) That the City Council consider additional notice to property owners upon request to list their property as Significant; 3) To include unique conditions for disassembly and reassembly as identified by Staff. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

2. Administrative - Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board choose one (1) awardee for the annual Preservation Award, select three (3) members to form an Artist Selection Committee, and discuss awarding commemorative plaques. (Application GI-15-02972)

Planner Grahn reported that each year the Historic Preservation Board chooses a site to receive a preservation award. She requested that three HPB members volunteer for the artist selection committee. In past years the Planning Department puts out an RFP and they ask artists to submit a sample of their work or a short portfolio. The submittals are reviewed and sometimes the committee interviews the artist before selecting an artist who will produce a piece of artwork depicting a historic preservation project.

Board Member Beatlebrox clarified that they would want an RFQ, not an RFP. An RFQ is a Request for Qualifications, which would include the portfolio and would not require an artist to come up with a proposal or any renderings of any proposed artwork. Ms. Beatlebrox stated that the reasons for an RFQ is that the commission for this piece is fairly low, and secondly, you can tell what the artists is going to provide you with by looking at their past work.

Board Member Melville asked what compensation they were offering the artist. Planner Grahn replied that it was \$800. Board Member Melville asked if the amount could be increased. Director Erickson replied that an increase was not in the budget. Board Member Holmgren pointed out that the artist also gets a lot of recognition because the original artwork is hung in the Marsac building. The artist also has the opportunity to use their artwork for notecards, etc. if they choose. Planner Grahn explained that the artist is allowed full copyright of

reproductions using their artwork. The original piece is hung in the Marsac Building with a plaque that states the year of the award, the building, and the artists name. Board Member Beatlebrox reiterated for the record that from the standpoint of the art world, \$800 is very low, substandard pay. It truly is a labor of love by the artist.

Board Members Beatlebrox and Holmgren volunteered for the selection committee. Planner Grahn would ask Board Members Hewitt and White if they were interested in sitting on the committee.

Planner Grahn noted that this was the fifth year that the HPB has been doing this program. In the past they talked about giving the recipient a plaque that would commemorate being an award winner. The public has also suggested that if there was a short history on some of the houses that it would help create a greater human connection to the building. If that was something the Board was interested in pursuing the Staff would bring it back in a work session.

Board Member Melville liked the idea. She also thought the sites that are nominated should also have a plaque. Ms. Melville suggested the idea of placing a plaque on any of the historic homes that were being redone. Planner Grahn thought it might be cost prohibitive to give a plaque to every home. Ms. Melville believed the owner could work the cost of the plaque into their budget for redoing the house. Chair Pro Tem Stephens favored that idea. If they know the cost of the plaque the City could offer it as part of the grant process.

Planner Grahn offered to come back in a work session to give the HPB more details on the plaque in terms of looks and cost.

Planner Grahn noted that every year the Staff nominates projects that were completed under the 2009 Design Guidelines. This year the Staff selected 337 Daly Avenue, 651 Park Avenue, and 343 Park Avenue. All three projects were outlined in the Staff report. Planner Grahn recommended that the Board choose one of the three as this year's award winner.

Board Member Beatlebrox noted that there were three nominees when they chose the garage, and one of those was the building that Fletcher's currently occupies. She wondered why that building was not moved into this nomination effort. Board Member Melville recalled that it was not considered last year because the project was not done. Ms. Beatlebrox agreed. However, now that it is completed she thought it could be nominated. Planner Grahn offered to look at that building as well. She recalled that it was passed over last year because it had been panelized. If the Board agreed, she would bring it forward as well. Ms. Beatlebrox thought they should look at it because the owners should be rewarded for their time and effort.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens asked if any of the buildings recommended uniquely solved a problem that maybe they have not seen in the past. Planner Grahn noted that 651 Park had to add a kitchen addition, and the corrugated metal addition could not be seen from the street. She stated that 337 Daly Avenue were great applicants. The owner is a structural engineer who was building the house himself. One of their issues was trying to balance modern and contemporary design. Planner Grahn noted that 343 Park Avenue was more of a traditional remodel. They had to work with an inline addition from the 1980s, but they did great landscape work and made an effort to rebuild the porch. Mr. Stephens asked if additional living space was added below that building. Planner Grahn thought the space already existed; however, the basement was redone. Board Member Melville thought the basement had been added. Mr. Stephens had the same recollection.

Director Erickson stated that since they were not in a hurry to select a site, the Staff could bring this back for another discussion. Chair Pro Tem Stephens assumed the Board members could submit additional suggestions to the Staff for consideration. Planner Grahn requested that other suggestions be submitted by next Wednesday with photos so she could include them in the Staff report.

Board Member Melville recalled awarding two buildings one year. One was the Talisker building as a Main Street commercial building. Planner Grahn discouraged awarding two buildings. One reason is the limited wall space for artwork, and she preferred to invest the funds into commemorative plaques. Chair Pro Tem Stephens thought the commemorative plaques were important because people notice the plaques as they walk around. Ms. Melville suggested the possibility of one painting and two plaques.

Planner Grahn recommended that they do one painting per year and one plaque for the same award recipient. Currently, the award winner is given a jpeg that is printed off of the printer and placed in a frame. She believed that giving the recipient a plaque was more symbolic than just a colored copy of the painting that hangs in City Hall. Planner Grahn also thought that giving plaques to the previous award winners is a good way to give recognition to the preservation award.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens called for a motion to continue the discussion at the next meeting.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the discussion of the Historic Preservation Board award to the next meeting. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

3. Design Guideline Revisions- Character Zones. Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss current limitations of the 2009 Design Guidelines and provide input to staff regarding the development of character zones.

Planner Grahn noted that the HPB had a discussion in October about how different areas or neighborhoods within Old Town look different because there are varying designs between one street and the next. At that time the Board was interested in discussing it further. The Staff had quickly identified 5 character zones to demonstrate what they believe are the different defining character features of the different zones. She would again ask whether the Board thought it was something worth pursuing. When they come back with specific Design Guidelines in the New Year they will make sure to incorporate criteria for these neighborhoods.

Planner Grahn noted that for purposes of this discussion she and Planner Grahn had identified five zones. They would come back with more detail if it was something the HPB wanted to pursue.

Planner Turpen reviewed exhibits. The first character zone was Ontario, which is characterized by steep slopes on the east side of town. Most of the houses face towards town. She presented photos showing how the new infill has garages and porches that face the street. Planner Turpen noted that this area has quite an eclectic streetscape.

Board Member Melville thought the primary character of this area was the private walkways in front of the house shown on the upper left of the exhibit, as well as the gray house shown on the bottom right. Planner Grahn reported that historically many of these houses were accessed by the staircases, which is why they were facing town. Ms. Melville noted that the staircases were in the private walkways. Planner Turpen pointed out that the walkways are still there, but current development is oriented towards the automobile. Board Member Beatlebrox noted that the vernacular on Ontario was different from the vernacular they might find on Daly.

Sandridge Road was the second character zone. It is similar to Ontario because the houses face town. Sandridge is unique because most of the houses have a shed which is along the existing Sandridge Road or in what would be the backyard of these houses. They also include ornate details.

Daly Avenue was the third character zone. Planner Turpen stated that Daly Avenue was historically a mix of industrial and residential architecture. Historically Silver Creek was day-lit which is why all of the houses on the east side of the street are set far back against the hillside and separate from the streetscape. There is not a consistent setback because they follow where the

hillside guts deep. However, on the other side the hillside is steep pretty consistently and there is more of a consistent setback. Also on Daly is that a number of houses have a garage in front of the house, which something you would not find on Park Avenue, for example. There is also a mix of boarding house, historic hall-parlor houses and small shacks. It was another eclectic streetscape in Old Town.

The fourth character zone was the 300 and 400 blocks of Park Avenue which retains the most historic integrity and concentration of buildings. Planner Grahn remarked that what makes this unique is that the west side is mostly residential, and the east side of the street backs up to Main Street. There is a mix of residential spill-over commercial uses and institutional buildings. This area was more affluent and some buildings have a lot of architectural ornamentation.

The last character zone was Main Street. Planner Turpen noted that there were zero setbacks, consistent setbacks, and the width for a lot of the buildings was determined by their use. A wide mix of materials was also used on these buildings.

Board Member Melville noted that the exhibits included non-historic buildings. Planner Turpen stated that the buildings were included because it was part of the streetscape. Ms. Melville asked what the Staff was proposing to do with the character zones. Planner Grahn stated that they were not proposing to change any of the LMC to address reduced setbacks or height. It would be an opportunity to create specific Design Guidelines that would address these character zones.

Planner Grahn noted that page 58 had items for discussion this evening. The first was whether the HPB finds that character zones are appropriate for Park City, and whether this was a suitable way to clearly define the distinctive areas of the Historic District.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought the answer was yes. The different neighborhoods are what make Park City diverse. She thought the idea of vernacular and characteristics was a good one to pursue.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that if they define these characteristics in individual zones, what would happen to the other areas or historic nature of those areas. He did not believe they would have as much directive. If they define certain areas quite precisely, he wanted to know what it would do to the rest of Old Town.

Planner Grahn stated that currently the Design Guidelines are set up to have Universal Guidelines, specific guidelines, and guidelines for Main Street. The Staff felt that was not doing Main Street justice. Main Street is the most different

character zone because residential and commercial are very different. Going forward the Staff would propose removing the Guidelines regarding Main Street and create its own section to be more specific about how to treat commercial buildings. In terms of the character zones, they would have to do a more thorough analysis. Secondly, they could not be Uber specific about each street as far as what could and could not be done. Planner Grahn assumed it would be a list of bullet points.

Planner Grahn pointed out that this was a short list to give the Board the opportunity to understand character zones. There were other character zones that were left out because the Staff did not have enough time to research all of the zones. If they pursue this, the Staff would come back with a complete list of anything that would be in a character zone. She noted that the outliers would have their own set of Guidelines as well.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens recalled a previous discussion about whether there is a Park City vernacular as they relook at the Guidelines. He thought that overlaid the whole Historic District, and within that they were specific things that might be different. His goal would be to make sure these were areas where different things actually take place in those neighborhoods. If they apply the LMC and the Historic District Guidelines to those neighborhoods they would come up with a product that maybe they were not pleased with. The easiest one for him to look at was not allowing garages in the front setback. However, he recognized that it was part of the character on Daly Avenue. Mr. Stephens clarified that for him it was less about defining how it looks and more about giving the character zones the ability to recognize what is different about those zones, and allowing flexibility in the design that continues to fit into the zone.

Board Member Melville understood that the character zones would provide more tools. Planner Grahn answered yes. She believed it would help with the compatibility discussion.

Board Member Holmgren wanted to see this more fluid rather than cast in concrete. The word Guidelines must be capitalized, italicized and in bold. She noted that the HPB previously went through a similar discussion about color and they were assured that it was only a guideline. She emphasized not cast in concrete because there was a big to-do a while back about housing on the dog field by the library, but eventually Jim and Carol Santy lived in a house there without issue. Ms. Holmgren thought these were good ideas and good guidelines and she thought they should be pursued, but she cautioned them about being too restrictive or specific.

Planner Grahn understood that the Board was generally in support of character zones and incorporation, and they will look at it more closely as they develop guidelines.

Planner Grahn noted that another question was whether each of the character zones defined in this report embody a distinctive pattern and development. She believed the Board saw what the Staff did in terms of distinctive patterns of development, housing styles and details.

Chair Pro Tem Stephens suggested that the Staff look at areas in the past where they have had problems with the design review process and character zones that would allow for more flexibility.

Director Erickson asked Planners Grahn and Turpen to update the Board on their vernacular tour through these districts. Planner Turpen reported that she and Planner Grahn were on the organizing committee for the 2017 Vernacular Architecture Forum Conference will be held in Salt Lake, but include a one-day tour in Park City. She noted that the Conference has not been held in Salt Lake since 1987. She and Anya have been working with the Museum and she assumed they would be asking the HPB for help as well. They were working diligently to get the tour finalized because the entire conference needs to be finalized in Spring 2016. It is important to make sure they showcase Park City in the right way and show what Park City is doing with preservation.

The meeting adjourned at 6:34 p.m.

Approved by _____
David White, Chair
Historic Preservation Board