

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF OCTOBER 21, 2015

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Chair David White, Lola Beatlebrox, Puggy Holmgren, Hope Melville, Douglas Stephens

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

ROLL CALL

Chair White called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Cheryl Hewett and Jack Hodgkins who were excused.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Director Erickson reported on scheduling to meet the deadline for the pending ordinance and LMC Amendments. HPB meetings were scheduled for November 4th and 18th and December 2nd, with a tentative meeting scheduled for December 16th if needed.

Director Erickson announced that Anya Grahn and Hannah Turpen would be attending the National Historic Preservation Conference in Washington, DC. in November.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff was looking at processes that need to be established moving forward under the new ordinance. One challenge they encountered was a historic structure that has two or three remodels that were also historic. The question is which age in history to acknowledge. If the Staff cannot find a workable solution they would schedule a work session with the HPB for their input on process. It would be a policy action and it would need to be approved by the Legal Department.

The Staff requested that the Board reverse the agenda and review the demolitions items first and then move to the Pending Ordinance discussion and the Compatibility Study discussion.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

Review of demolition permits for the following Buildings and Structures to be considered under the pending ordinance

1. 1114 Park Avenue - Demolition Determination – The applicant is requesting to remove: non-historic windows, a portion of the non-historic rear wall, non-historic doors, a portion of the non-historic enclosed porch, the non-historic garage door on the historic single-car garage accessory structure, one (1) historic window on the single-car garage accessory structure, a portion of the historic north wall of the historic single-car garage accessory structure, and lift the house and single-car garage accessory structure for a new crawlspace foundation.
(Application PL-15-02587)

Planner Turpen reviewed the HDDR design review application for 1114 Park Avenue in the HRM District. The structure is listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory. The applicant would like to add an addition; however, the HPB was only reviewing the elements that need to be removed to accommodate the renovation and addition.

Planner Turpen stated that the applicant would like to remove portions of the enclosed porch, which is not historic. The original porch was an ornate porch as shown in the 1940's tax photo. Planner Turpen asked if the Board had any issues with the removal of that material.

Board Member Melville understood that the Board was not looking at the design of the addition, but she asked if the porch would be replaced with another porch of some type of historic design. Planner Turpen stated that the original porch would not come back but it would be replaced with something more consistent and appropriate for the structure. Ms. Melville asked if the Staff had checked the Museum for photos of what the original porch looked like. Planner Turpen had not checked with the Museum; however based on the 1978 site survey it was an ornate porch with turn posts. Ms. Melville asked if the 1929 Sanborn showed a porch. Planner Turpen replied that there was a porch and it was shown on the 1940s photos because it had not been removed yet. An extensive alteration occurred in the 1960s. The applicant did an exploration demolition and could not find any evidence of the historic porch. Planner Turpen stated that in talking with the Design Review Team, the Staff finds that what was being proposed would be appropriate for the structure, even though it would not be a porch. Ms. Melville asked Planner Turpen to check with the Museum to see if they had photos.

Chair White understood that the enclosed porch would be removed and he asked if the roof above it would remain. Planner Turpen answered yes. She stated that it would maintain the semblance of a porch but she was not able to give the HPB

an idea of what would be going in because if it gets appealed they would be the appeal body.

The Board was comfortable with the removal of the porch.

Planner Turpen stated that the next item was removal of the rear wall. She presented an exhibit showing where the modern addition that occurred in the 1960's starts in relation to the historic home. No historic material would be impacted by the removal of the rear wall and it would be accommodating a small addition.

Board Member Melville asked if the non-historic addition would remain with the exception of the back wall. Planner Turpen answered yes. Ms. Melville was not opposed to it but she thought it was unusual. Planner Turpen stated that given the configuration of the lot it made sense to keep the existing addition. He pointed out that the new addition would be smaller than the existing house. Ms. Melville asked if the current siding on both the historic and non-historic portions would remain. Planner Turpen replied that the applicant was not proposing to replace the siding. She believed the siding was added in the 1960s because it matches the modern addition. The porch also has the same siding.

The Board had no issues with removing the non-historic rear wall.

Planner Turpen stated that the next item was to remove a portion of the north wall of the historic garage to accommodate a connection between the existing historic structure and the historic single car garage. It is a small portion that would not be visible from the public right-of-way. The Staff found that it would not have a negative impact on the historic structure.

Board Member Melville asked if the connection would be on the new addition to the house. Planner Turpen answered yes. The Board had no issues with removing a portion of the north wall of the historic garage.

Planner Turpen noted that in the 1960s most of the windows were switched out and the historic window openings were lost. The applicant completed an interior exploratory demo and discovered where the original windows openings were located. She presented the south elevation to show the areas outside of the existing windows that would be opened up to accommodate historically accurate window openings.

Board Member Melville did not think the middle window looked historic. Planner Turpen noted that the middle window would be replaced but the applicant was not proposing to alter the shape or size. Board Member Beatlebrox thought it was a good idea if it followed the lines of what was original in place.

Planner Turpen had spoken with the applicant prior to this meeting and clarified that they were not lifting the historic garage or replacing the foundation. The house is located within the flood plain so it will be lifted two feet and the existing foundation will be replaced. The new foundation will be concrete and standard for a flood plain. Planner Turpen clarified that all of the foundation was being removed to accommodate for a new crawl space.

Board Member Beatlebrox had visited the property and it looked very sturdy. She assumed the house could be lifted without any concern for damage. Planner Turpen stated that the applicant will take all the necessary precautions, which were addressed in their historic preservation plan. The Chief Building Official will review and approve the historic preservation plan to make sure the proposal meets the IBC and any concerns.

Board Member Melville noted that the inside of the house was already gutted. She asked if the applicant was proposing to brace the inside of the house when it is lifted. Planner Turpen reiterated that the applicant would do whatever is necessary to meet the IBC standards for successfully lifting a house. She noted that the Historic Preservation Plan is reviewed by the Planner who then sends it to the Planning Director and the Chief Building Official for their review and approval. Ms. Melville clarified that the garage would not be lifted. Planner Turpen stated that she was mistaken when she wrote the Staff report and that the garage would not be lifted. The applicant was not proposing to alter the height or the foundation of the garage.

Planner Turpen stated that none of the doors on the exterior of the house were historic. The applicant was proposing to remove the existing doors and replace them with historically accurate doors. Ms. Melville assumed the Staff would make sure that the replacement doors were appropriate.

Planner Turpen noted that the applicant was proposing to remove 11 non-historic windows from the historic house. One historic window on the single car garage will be removed to allow for an operable window. The existing window is fixed and would not meet egress requirements. The replacement window will be historically accurate.

Board Member White asked if the existing garage window was steel framed. Planner Turpen answered yes. Ms. Melville wanted to know why they were replacing a historic window with a non-historic window. Planner Turpen explained that the garage is being converted to living space, which requires an operable window for egress. The existing window does not open and it could not be an emergency exit.

Board Member Melville asked what would happen to the historic window because she would not like to see it discarded. Planner Turpen replied that the City could

not control what the owner does with the window. Board Member Stephens noted that historic windows have limited use because they are single-pane glass and not very effective for living space in Park City. Director Erickson stated that the Staff could suggest that the applicant find someone who might want the window as opposed to just discarding it. Board Member Holmgren suggested that an artist might want it. Ms. Melville stated that they have very little historic material left in town and it would be nice if the removed materials could be used on another building or somewhere else.

Planner Grahn stated that the Design Guidelines talk about being sustainable and try to keep as much material out of the landfill as possible. However, the Staff does not regulate what happens with removed material or how to dispose of it.

Kevin Horn, representing the applicant, stated that in their documents they could require that the window be preserved. He was certain that they could find a home for that historic window. Mr. Horn noted that the new window would be very similar to the historic window and there would not be noticeable difference looking from the street.

There was consensus from the Board for the applicant to remove all 12 of the historic and non-historic windows.

MOTION: Board Member Melville moved to APPROVE the demolition of portions of non-historic and historic materials at 1114 Park Avenue as specified in the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 1114 Park Avenue

1. The property is located at 1114 Park Avenue.
2. The house is listed as “Significant” on the Historic Sites Inventory (HSI). The single car garage accessory structure is associated with the site and is also considered historic as it contributes to the historic context of the house and site as a whole.
3. The historic house was constructed c. 1901.
4. Sometime after the 1940’s, the historic ornate front porch was either removed completely or enclosed (screened-in).
5. According to the 1978 Utah State Historic Society Historic Preservation Site Information Form, in 1960 a one-story addition was added to the rear of the historic house with a sun deck in the rear yard.
6. A single-car garage accessory structure was added sometime after 1929. The current accessory structure does not show up on the 1929 Sanborn Map and accessory structures were not always documented as a part of the 1978 survey. .

It is not clear exactly when the garage was added, although staff has concluded that it was likely constructed in the 1940's or 1950's based on its materials and simple form.

7. On July 2, 2015, the Planning Department received a Historic District Design Review (HDDR) Application. The application was deemed complete on August 21, 2015. The application is still under review by the Planning Department. Revisions were submitted on October 2, 2015.

8. The applicant will remove the existing north, south, and west non-historic walls of the non-historic enclosed porch.

9. The applicant will remove the entire (225.5 total square feet) non-historic east (rear) wall of the house.

10. The applicant will remove a portion (41.25 total square feet) of the historic north wall of the historic single-car garage accessory structure.

11. The applicant will remove a portion (6.75 total square feet) of the historic south wall on the historic house surrounding two (2) existing non-historic windows.

12. The applicant will lift the non-historic and historic portions of the house and the historic single-car garage accessory structure for a new crawlspace and replace the existing non-historic and historic portions of the concrete foundation.

13. The applicant will remove five (5) non-historic doors and one (1) non-historic single car garage door.

14. The applicant will remove one (1) historic and eleven (11) non-historic windows.

Conclusions of Law – 1114 Park Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-M District and the pending ordinance.

Conditions of Approval – 1114 Park Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the revised HDDR proposal stamped in on October 2, 2015. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

2. Where historic exterior materials cannot be repaired, they shall be replaced with materials that match the original in all respects: scale, dimension, texture, profile, material, and finish. The replacement of existing historic material shall be allowed only after the applicant can show that the historic materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition. No substitute materials have been proposed at this time. The applicant shall work with the Planning Department to review the condition of all historic materials prior to disposal.

2. 422 Ontario Avenue - Exploratory demo of non-historic exterior aluminum siding in order to inspect condition of historic wood siding beneath. (Application PL-15-02819)

Planner Grahn reviewed the request for an exploratory demolition permit. She noted that typically the HPB does not review these requests unless they are exterior under the pending ordinance. This was an exterior demolition.

Planner Grahn reported that the applicant was proposing to remove siding on the inside of the porch as shown on page 58 of the Staff report. Red lines indicated where the siding would be removed. Planner Grahn stated that siding was being removed in the specified locations because they were the least visible from the public right-of-way. The applicant also believes the historic material is most intact underneath the 1970s asphalt shingles siding and the Circa 1958 Bricktex. There are several layers of non-historic siding that the applicant would like to remove in order to assess the condition of the original wood siding.

Planner Grahn stated that this application would come back to the HPB as a full historic district design review in the future when the applicant submits an application to renovate and restore the entire house. The exploratory demolition permit is necessary in order for the applicant to do the physical conditions report and preservation plan. The house is listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.

Board Member Melville assumed that the non-historic Bricktex and asphalt shake would be removed regardless of whether or not there was historic wood underneath. Planner Grahn replied that they would like to remove it, but removing it from the entire building would be part of the historic district design review. To only remove it in specific areas is part of an exploratory demolition permit. Ms. Melville believed the siding would still have to be removed entirely. Planner Grahn agreed that it probably would but it still required HPB approval.

Board Member Melville was pleased that the applicant wanted to do the exploratory demolition. Chair White agreed that exploratory demolitions were good.

MOTION: Board Member Melville moved to APPROVE the exterior exploratory demolition of non-historic asbestos shingle and Bricktex siding on the north and south facades of 422 Ontario Avenue according to the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and Conditions of Approval found in the Staff report. Board Member Beatlebrox seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Findings of Fact – 422 Ontario Avenue

1. The property is located at 422 Ontario Avenue.
2. The building is listed as Significant on the Historic Sites Inventory.
3. The property is located within the Historic Residential (HR-1) District.
4. The removal of the non-historic asbestos shingle siding dating from the 1970s and Bricktex siding from c.1958 is considered exploratory exterior demolition.
5. The siding removal will occur on the north and west facades of the original crosswing's stem, where the exploratory demolition will be least visible from the public right-of-way.
6. The Bricktex dates from c.1958 and the asbestos shake siding was likely added in the 1970s. Neither of these materials are original to the building as it was originally clad in wood drop-novelty siding, as seen in the historic tax photograph.
7. No historic material will be removed.
8. The removal of these items will not affect the historic materials of the building. Rather, the purpose of this demolition permit is exploratory only; the intent is to determine the amount of historic wood siding present and its condition.
9. The applicant applied for a Building Permit for the exploratory demolition on September 29, 2015.

Conclusions of Law – 422 Ontario Avenue

1. The proposal complies with the Land Management Code requirements pursuant to the HR-1 District and the pending ordinance.

Conditions of Approval – 422 Ontario Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the proposal stamped in on September 29, 2015. Any changes, modifications, or deviations from the approved design that have not been approved by the Planning and Building Departments may result in a stop work order.

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.

Board Member Melville clarified that this was the same ordinance the HPB had seen in previous meetings. Planner Grahn answered yes. She explained that it keeps coming back on the agenda to give the HPB the opportunity to provide further comments. Ms. Melville noted that the Board has discussed changes in previous meetings regarding the demolition portion of the ordinance, and she would like those comments and changes carried forward in the Staff reports to

give the Board the opportunity to revise the changes they previously requested if necessary.

Planner Grahn stated that the direction given by the Planning Commission was for the Staff to start redlining the Land Management Code amendments. The intent was to bring those redlines to the HPB on November 18th for their review. Ms. Melville asked if it was possible for the November 4th meeting to include the changes the HPB had already recommended. Director Erickson stated that the Staff was trying to avoid having several versions of the legal redlining. Ms. Melville clarified that she was only asking for a separate list of changes that the HPB had suggested in previous meetings. She recalled that the HPB had only addressed the Demolition section.

Planner Grahn recalled from the last meeting that the Board had discussed a third category of Contributory structures. She was also willing to hear feedback on how to designate Significant structures. Ms. Melville recalled that the Board has made no changes to the redlining of the ordinance 15-11-10A(2), Significant Site. However, they had made suggestions for the new section on Demolition.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that the only changes she could recall had to do with whether or not to the HPB needed to review a certain level of demolition. Ms. Melville reiterated her request for a list of changes the HPB had suggested to this point.

Board Member Stephens stated that so far the process was easy because the Board was only making decisions on historic or non-historic. However, if the Staff comes forward with a historic addition and the HPB is asked to make a judgement on whether or not it could be removed or demolished, he wanted to know which LMC or Guidelines issues the HPB would use to make that judgement call. He was asking the question because of the historic garage they had just discussed at 1114 Park Avenue. He noted that a garage with cinder block construction would not be viewed as historic as much as one that is clearly historic with wood frame construction. Mr. Stephens wanted to know how they would treat those two garages differently within the LMC. He believed any applicant would want to know what the Board would be judging their request against.

Planner Grahn reported that during the last Planning Commission meeting the Commissioners provided feedback on the pending ordinance. One of their concerns was the importance of having demolition criteria in order to be transparent and fair to every applicant. Planner Grahn stated that as the Staff works through the process of the Historic Preservation Board review, they would also draft demolition criteria as a gauge to help the Board make their decisions. The intent was to have the draft criteria ready for the November 18th HPB meeting.

Director Erickson stated that it was a multi-step process. The first is to improve the definition of demolition; the second is to draft criteria for demolition; the third is to determine the relationship between the definition and the criteria and align it with a Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition which has the economic hardship criteria and the dangerous building abatement. Four elements could affect the alteration of a historic structure and the Staff was working through all four.

Director Erickson noted that the Certificate of Appropriateness for Demolition was already in the LMC and the abatement of dangerous structures was already in the Building Code. The Staff was trying to align those with the definition of demolition and the criteria for smaller demolitions.

Board Member Melville was hopeful that they would not run out of time before the pending ordinance expired. Her preference would be to get the ordinance passed within the six month timeframe, and make additional changes after it was adopted if necessary. Planner Grahn agreed. She outlined what the Staff was currently working on to keep the process on schedule. Planner Grahn stated that Demolition by Neglect was temporarily on hold in order to focus on the parts of the ordinance that needed to move forward. She noted that Demolition by Neglect is a bigger topic and the Planning Department needs to work with the Building Department and the Planning Department before it could be redlined. Ms. Melville stated that if the Staff finds that Contributory structures would cause a delay, she recommended that it be a topic for later as well so it would not hold up approval of the pending ordinance.

Board Member Beatlebrox had driven around and looked at several properties that Ms. Melville had suggested at the last meeting and she came to the conclusion that it was nearly impossible to legislate taste. Director Erickson remarked that once the Staff drafts compatibility guidelines he would suggest that the Board members on their own drive around and look at buildings and come back with comments regarding the Guidelines and compatibility.

Director Erickson suggested that the Board continue their discussion on the ordinance and then address Ms. Beatlebrox's comments during the discussion regarding compatibility and contributory structures.

Director Erickson stated that on November 18th the Staff would like the HPB to forward a positive recommendation on the suggested changes they would like to see move forward. The Staff would redline those changes and move them through the Planning Commission and the City Council.

Chair White believed the Board was comfortable with the existing redlines. Director Erickson summarized that the redlines included the IBC change, the change from 1975 to 40 years, and the updated definition of demolition.

Board Member Stephens thought the difficulty for the HPB would be making decisions on smaller issues and partial demolitions on historic buildings. He wanted to make sure the Board would have something to judge that against. He asked if it was possible for the Board to review the criteria before November 18th so they would be better prepared to discuss it. Director Erickson thought it might be possible to provide something prior to November 18th.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff was also working on items that the HPB did not want to review and was willing to let the Staff make the determination. Planner Grahn noted that based on comments by the Board, as well as procedures from other jurisdictions, if an item is considered maintenance repair it would not have to come to the HPB and the Planning Director would make the determination. New material on the historic portion of the building would come under HPB review; however, something like removing material on an addition for a dryer vent would be reviewed by Staff. The Staff was working on how to define those situations and how to codify it.

Board Member Melville agreed with Mr. Stephens that it would be helpful to see that information prior to the November 18th meeting so they could provide their comments to Staff and be ready to forward a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Planner Grahn thought it would be possible to provide a bullet list memo to the HPB. Ms. Melville would like the list to include the changes made by the Board and the decisions they had made to this point. It was important to make sure that the Board was in agreement on the changes and understood what they would be forwarding to the Planning Commission on November 18th. Director Erickson remarked that it would require some type of public noticing and he and the Staff would work on it. There was a possibility that they would be able to have a draft ready by the November 4th meeting. He pointed out that if the Board needed additional time for discussion and was not prepared to forward a recommendation on November 18th, they were scheduled to have at least one meeting in December.

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the review of recommendations and modifications to the pending ordinance to amend the LMC Section 15, Chapter 11 as listed on the agenda to November 4, 2015. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

COMPABILITY STUDY– Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board review and discuss current weaknesses of the 2009 Design Guidelines and provide input to staff to address these issues.

Planner Grahn reported that the Staff was trying to address the changes to the Design Guidelines concurrently with the pending ordinance. However, they plan to delve further into the Guidelines in more detail once the ordinance passes.

Planner Grahn noted that the Board discussed some of the Guidelines at their last meeting and continued their discussion to this evening. She referred to page 20 of the Staff report, Defining Compatibility. They have looked to other cities to determine how compatibility could be defined. The LMC provides a definition but it is not very specific. The Staff proposed adding terms to the definition to make it more specific. At the last meeting the Board talked about what the terms mean and how they relate to the streetscape and the structure. Planner Grahn stated that after reading through the terms the Staff realized they were repeating the same information after each item. Therefore, the Staff decided it was better to just incorporate the bullet points used to evaluate compatibility into the existing definition of compatibility. The bullet points were outlined on page 20 of the Staff report. Planner Grahn noted that the Staff would be coming back with a redlined definition of Compatibility with the incorporated terms.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board members had questions or comments on the proposed terms, and whether other terms should be incorporated into the list.

Board Member Melville asked what was currently in the Design Guidelines. Planner Grahn replied that Compatibility is addressed more under the section of New Construction in the Design Guidelines. They are Universal Guidelines that hone in on what compatibility is in terms of architectural style consistent with styles in the area, etc. However, the Guidelines do not define compatibility point by point. It is a much broader definition.

Board Member Melville read language from the Universal Guidelines related to compatibility. Director Erickson remarked that the new Guidelines proposed by Staff were more precise and more focused, and provides a more measureable outcome of what does or does not comply with the Universal Guidelines. Ms. Melville asked if the Staff was proposed to keep the existing Guidelines and adding ones that were more specific. Planner Grahn answered yes. As they delve further into the Guidelines and start talking about specific elements they could address rhythm, solids to voids, proportions of opening and other more specific elements at that time. Planner Grahn stated that they could amend the definition of compatibility with the bullet point items and flush them out later with the Design Guidelines. Ms. Melville was comfortable with that approach. She agreed that the details of the windows and doors were important, but the larger impacts to the building such as mass and scale were also important. She

pointed out that some of the problem buildings they were seeing in town were a result of concentrating on the details but missing the overall mass and scale. Ms. Melville questioned whether the Universal Guidelines were being applied. Planner Grahn stated that the Universal Guidelines were being applied, but it goes back to fine tuning and being more specific. The Guidelines are large brush strokes that are applied to individual buildings. Planner Grahn suggested that they might want to look at creating a separate section for the Main Street and commercial buildings and remove them from where they are in the Guidelines currently. They could have that discussion after the first of the year when they start getting into more specifics with the Guidelines.

Planner Grahn clarified that for now the HPB was being asked to define Compatibility by incorporating the items listed on page 22 of the Staff report into the existing Definition of Compatibility, which is outlined in the Land Management Code.

Planner Turpen noted that the definition was not being added to the Design Guidelines. The purpose is to codify Compatibility in the LMC, which is stronger than the Design Guidelines. Board Member Melville pointed out that the Planning Commission addresses Land Management Code and it was out of the purview of the HPB. Assistant City Attorney McLean confirmed that the HPB did not have authority for the LMC. Planner Turpen noted that the Staff still wanted input from the HPB regarding the Definition before it goes to the Planning Commission. Ms. McLean stated that like the LMC, the Design Guidelines are adopted by resolution by the City Council; but the Council wanted HPB input and recommendations on both the Design Guidelines and the LMC. Ms. Melville wanted to be clear that the HPB was not looking at the Design Guidelines. They were being asked to give their recommendation on a proposed change to the LMC that would be decided by the Planning Commission. Ms. McLean stated that she was correct.

Board Member Stephens referred to the bullet points and he understood how they helped define and strengthen the LMC. He noted that there was an actual number associated with the height, and while it might be nice to have a specific number, he was concerned that it might create design issues. Mr. Stephens recalled a previous discussion in this presentation about the relationship of floor levels and porches to the surrounding structures. He thought that by itself would handle the height issue. He suggested that the Staff look at that possibility. Mr. Stephens was unsure whether the 5' number would be successful in the long run. Planner Turpen noted that Salt Lake also uses a specific number for their height. Mr. Stephens cited a home on Upper Park Avenue where the 5' number would create a very unusual house being built next to it based on the rhythm and pattern. He believed there were other mechanisms in the LMC and the Design Guidelines to restrict the height of the buildings.

Ms. Melville asked if the Staff had photos they could show to demonstrate the reason for the proposals in terms of compatibility. Planner Grahn thought they could relook at some of the examples of individual projects that were given earlier.

Chair White stated that there was a glaring problem with the height situation on Daly Avenue where nice historic homes sitting in a canyon have huge buildings on either side of them. Planner Grahn thought they could definitely remove the 5' height. When they address specific guidelines for mass and scale, they can look at how to better define height to keep it more consistent on the streetscape.

Board Member Melville asked if the definition of compatibility would be going to the Planning Commission soon; or if it was longer term, whether it would hold up adoption of the pending ordinance. Planner Grahn replied that if the Staff finds that it would delay the ordinance they would remove the definition. Ms. Melville felt certain that the Planning Commission would want to see the need for this change and how it would work in terms of buildings. Director Erickson stated that in some cases the Staff was responding to the City Council direction on compatibility. He thought it was particularly apparent in the joint meeting between the HPB and the City Council. Director Erickson noted that the Planning Commission has a different role and it would be fine if they needed more time for the Staff to raise their conscience on preservation issues.

Board Member Melville referred to the structure at 535 Woodside shown on page 31 of the Staff report and she asked Planner Grahn to explain how the new definition would have avoided that building. Planner Grahn believed it applies to the proportion of openings within the facility. There is a lot of glass and it is very wide. Ms. Melville pointed out that it was a style that did not exist in Park City. Planner Grahn was not the project planner but she assumed the applicant might have argued that it was a modern interpretation of industrial mining. Planner Grahn pointed out the rhythm to voids ratio on the building and asked if the solid to void ratio was consistent with a historic house next door. She applied materials and texture and talked about the roof form. Ms. Melville asked the style of windows would it be referenced. Planner Grahn stated that the Design Guidelines would recommend style of windows. It is a very fine detail of compatibility rather than the larger picture. Planner Grahn noted that the scale and volume of the building at 535 Woodside was very large and she thought it could have been broken up a better to reflect the mass and scale of the adjacent structures.

Director Erickson stated that if the proposed guidelines had been adopted in LMC the building at 535 Woodside would have been much different. He pointed out that it was a remodel of a 1970s building, but they would not have seen the elements Planner Grahn and Ms. Melville pointed out. Mr. Stephens believed the 1970s building would not have been built under the new guidelines. Ms. Melville

emphasized the need to provide visuals to the Planning Commission to demonstrate why the proposed guidelines are important.

Board Member Stephens understood that the guidelines would prevent the types of structures they do not want to see in Old Town, but at the same time they would not want to see repetitive architecture right next to each other. He asked if the Staff had anything that would prevent two almost identical homes from being built next to each other. Planner Turpen stated that the Staff encounters those situations quite often. They stand by the Guideline that speaks to the rhythm and dominant pattern of the streetscape. Generally and historically there are not identical structures on a street and that is the established pattern. The applicants are told that having two identical houses is not consistent with the existing pattern on the street. Planner Turpen noted that the Staff has recently honed in on that Guideline and they were steering architects in that direction. There has been some pushback primarily due to the cost issue of having to pay for two designs.

Board Member Stephens asked if Ms. McLean was comfortable defending the Staff's position to stand by the Guideline. Ms. McLean stated that the more concrete and defined they make the criteria, it becomes more defensible but it is still difficult. Mr. Stephens explained that he asked the question because once it is adopted into the LMC the applicant has a strong argument if their application meets the LMC. Director Erickson stated that the HPB could recommend adding a bullet point stating that repetitive designs are not consistent with the design guidelines. Board Member Melville thought it was better to have the statement in the LMC versus the Design Guidelines. She used the example of garage doors. The Guidelines say there should not be two garage doors on a single lot. However, the LMC states that the front of the house should not be substantially garage door. It is easier to enforce it when it is part of the LMC because the Guidelines are recommendations that could be argued. Director Erickson agreed that the LMC is stronger. If the bulleted items proposed in the Staff report are included in the definition and adopted into the LMC, they could add language stating that repetitive designs are not consistent with the rhythm and scale of the neighborhood as defined.

Board Member Beatlebrox wanted to know what would happen in a case like Mountainlands Trust where they there are two replicate structures. Director Erickson replied that the Staff would recommend architectural changes. Ms. Melville pointed out that in most cases a slight change would be enough to make the structures look different. Chair White thought it was important to be specific as opposed to just saying no replication because people will do whatever they can to get around it.

Board Member Beatlebrox commented on the question of whether or not they should define a vernacular. She was concerned that the examples of modern

architecture that were successful might be legislated out. Ms. Beatlebrox liked the discussion regarding the bullet points, but she felt it was difficult to legislate taste. Director Erickson stated that the Staff was starting to define sub-neighborhoods of different types of rhythm and scale and that will help define compatibility. He believed the inclusion of modern style architecture using the elements of design in the Guidelines will result in homes of appropriate scale. Mr. Erickson used 41 Sampson as an example. Ms. Beatlebrox thought they needed to have samples of very compatible structures and then identify the reasons why they are compatible and what are the Best Practices success factors.

Director Erickson noted that some HPB Board members have asked for the background ordinances and the Best Practice drawings. He stated that what came in from Tahoe and Denver was very specific. As they move forward he believed the requested background information would be helpful.

Board Member Melville commented on 41 Sampson Avenue. It was a historic building but the historic building is gone. She did not believe that was the example they were trying to achieve with the Guidelines. Planner Grahn pointed out that 41 Sampson had approvals under the previous Design Guidelines and it was actually in litigation with the Building Department. What was actually constructed was not consistent with the 2009 adopted Design Guidelines. Director Erickson agreed with Ms. Melville that 41 Sampson was not something they would want to see from the standpoint of historic. His intent was to use it as an example of mass and scale.

Director Erickson suggested that the Board members take the list of compatibility guidelines and walk the neighborhoods to see how they work. Instead of the Staff providing pictures, he asked that the Board members take pictures of structures that they would like the HPB to review and discuss with the Staff.

Board Member Melville thought it was important to remember that this was a Historic District. If they want to keep the sense of a historic district the structure has to fit, regardless of whether or not they like the building. Mr. Erickson agreed that the Historic District is not the place to make a bold statement of change. Board Member Stephens noted that they also needed to look to the General Plan, and the General Plan calls for rhythm of patterns and mass and scale. They needed to keep that in mind even through the LMC process.

Planner Turpen requested that the HPB continue the next section, Character Zones, to the November 18th meeting. The Staff was still working on a package with good examples of character zones to help the Board decide whether it was something they would like to see move forward. It was a longer term project that was not part of the pending ordinance. Planner Turpen provided a brief explanation of character zones and their purpose.

Historic Preservation Board Meeting
October 21, 2015

Board Member Stephens understood that they were going through the character zone process because the Staff needed additional flexibility in approving architecture that would be appropriate for specific neighborhoods. He noted that the Guidelines fit across the board and apply everywhere. A character zone might allow something that is appropriate in that particular neighborhood but not anywhere else. He believed character zones would give the architectural community the opportunity to build the best product for the site.

The meeting adjourned at 6:14 p.m.

Approved by _____
David White, Chair
Historic Preservation Board