

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
MINUTES OF DECEMBER 2, 2015

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

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

---

ROLL CALL

Chair White called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except Cheryl Hewett who was excused. Board Member Beatlebrox arrived later in the meeting.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There were no comments.

ADOPTION OF MINUTES

MOTION: Board Member Holmgren moved to CONTINUE the November 18, 2015 minutes to January 6, 2016. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

STAFF/BOARD COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

Planning Director Bruce Erickson noted that this would be the last HPB meeting in 2015. He commented on the number of extra meetings that took place in 2015 and he thanked the Board for their efforts. Director Erickson also recognized the extra efforts of the Planning Staff. He wished everyone a Happy Holidays.

Director Erickson stated that an agenda item this evening would be a broader context discussion regarding neighborhood compatibility, shaping the neighborhood characters, and trying to make a distinction between where icon buildings are appropriate and how buildings fit together.

REGULAR AGENDA – Discussion, Public Hearing and Possible Action

1. Administrative – Staff recommends the Historic Preservation Board choose one (1) awardee for the annual Preservation Award

Planner Grahn reported that at the last meeting the Staff brought forward three nominations for the Annual Preservation Award. At that time, Board Member Beatlebrox asked that 562 Main Street also be considered for nomination.

Planner Grahn referred to the last sentence on page 3 of the Staff report under 562 Main Street which stated, "The project is nearing completion and expected to be finished prior to Sundance." She noted that 562 Main Street was also a nominee for the 2014 award and the last sentence was inadvertently carried over from last year. Planner Grahn clarified that the project was completed.

Planner Grahn presented visuals of the nominated projects: 562 Main Street, 337 Daly Avenue, 651 Park Avenue, which was the new High West building, and 343 Park Avenue, which is a residential structure that received a grant. She requested that the Board choose one of these projects to receive the 2015 Historic Preservation Award.

Board Member Melville recalled from the last meeting that the Board had mentioned other potential recipients. She explained why she thought 1049 Park Avenue should also be nominated. Planner Grahn thought 1049 Park Avenue had received a grant in 2012 or 2013.

Board Member Melville stated that if the purpose of the Historic Preservation award is to promote historic preservation, she questioned whether it should be limited to one recipient. She thought recognizing additional preservation projects would promote historic preservation better than a painting of one recipient. Planner Grahn noted that the Board previously discussed placing plaques on structures and she would be bringing back additional information and costs to continue that discussion in January. At that time the Board could also discuss whether or not to restructure the program or continue with the paintings. Ms. Melville was not opposed to choosing one recipient for a painting, but she did not think they should be limited to recognizing only one recipient when there were so many others that deserved to be recognized as well. Ms. Melville noted that a plaque or a sign on a building or on the street would be seen by more people than a painting in City Hall.

Board Member Beatlebrox liked the idea of the painting because it also supports the local artists. However, she agreed with Ms. Melville on the idea of having one recipient for the painting and other recipients for a plaque. Ms. Beatlebrox thought that would send the message that multiple preservation projects are done each years.

Board Member Holmgren liked the idea of the plaques; however, she would not want so many that it would become common. She thought the award should be a special recognition. Board Member Melville remarked that all four of the

buildings that were nominated this year, including 1049 Park Avenue, turned out exceptional and she thought they all deserved to be recognized.

Chair Member White agreed that there were a lot of preservation projects this year and he anticipated the same for next year. Many of those projects were well-done and he did not think they should be limited to choosing just one. Chair White favored keeping the painting for one recipient.

Board Member Holmgren asked if the criteria for nomination were based only on how the project looks or its role in the community. Planner Grahn referred to page 7 of the Staff report, which talks about the different categories for nominating a structure. Most of the awarded structures have been for excellence in restoration or an adaptive reuse. Planner Grahn stated that in terms of criteria for choosing the structure, the HPB has the purview to create the program and to manage it. Ms. Holmgren pointed out that some of the nominated structures have no parking and in some cases the parking was eliminated. That was one reason for asking whether the criteria was strictly visual or part of the community.

Ms. Beatlebrox wanted to know why parking would add to the historic value of the property. Board Member Holmgren replied that if it is based on community, they need to decide whether the preservation made it a better part of the community or if it created a detriment. Planner Grahn clarified the parking situation. For examples, if commercial uses on Main Street do not provide parking on-site they most likely paid into China Bridge.

Board Member Stephens preferred to only do the plaques and not the artwork. They do not have the funds to sufficiently pay the artist; and if the intent is to put art in the City halls that should be done through more traditional methods. Mr. Stephens pointed out that once the first plaque is done the cost is lower for the second and third plaque. He agreed with Chair White that they would be seeing more preservation projects; and he agreed with Ms. Melville that they should be encouraging all types of preservation construction, both commercial and residential. Mr. Stephens thought the Board felt strongly that all four projects were good examples of restoration. It was difficult to say that one was better than the other and he would like to honor all of them.

Planner Grahn stated that in January should be bring back options for the plaques for the Board to review.

Assistant City Attorney McLean suggested that the agenda also include the policy for the awards to give the HPB the opportunity to have that discussion and propose changes to the policy. Ms. Melville thought the plaques for commercial building could go on the structure. However, plaques for a residential structure should be on a retaining wall or someplace away from the house so people can see it without going onto the residential property.

Board Member Beatlebrox requested that the Staff put together a list of possibilities for criteria to avoid having to start from scratch.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the Historic Preservation Award Program decision-making to January 6, 2016. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Hodgkins asked when the HPB needed to make the decision. Planner Grahn stated that the goal has always been to present the award in May which is Preservation Month, and the painting is unveiled at a joint HPB/City Council meeting. However, she did not believe there was a hard deadline for presenting the award. Board Member Melville thought it would be nice if the Park Record could run an article noting that four building were recognized for a fantastic restoration.

Director Erickson requested that the HPB redo the motion and continue the awards discussion to the second meeting in January.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the Historic Preservation Award Program decision-making to the second meeting in January. Board Member Stephens seconded the motion

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

## WORK SESSION

Compatibility 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 goal was to use the photos that the Board members were asked to turn into the Planning Department. The Staff was prepared to show 12 buildings and Planner Grahn asked that the HPB comment on each one individual in terms of whether or not it is compatible and why or why not. The Staff had provided criteria to help with the discussion. She asked that the Board focus their comments on mass and scale, proportions of windows and doors, and rhythm and scale of openings. She preferred not to discuss colors, materials, or aesthetics this evening. The Staff was looking for feedback and direction from the HPB so help direct the Staff in revising the Design Guidelines.

Board Member Melville had taken photos in various sections of what might be compatible and what might not be compatible. She had a handout for everyone and requested that they look at what she had prepared at the end of this discussion.

### 628 Park Avenue

Planner Grahn presented a photo of 628 Park Avenue and asked if the addition on the left side was compatible or incompatible. Board Member Melville clarified that the building on the right was historic and the brothel from the early 1900s. Planner Grahn answered yes.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it was clear that the addition was not the historic element. In terms of compatibility, she thought it was too modern and did not follow the lines. She thought it was clunky and somewhat of an eyesore. She asked how the Staff would apply the Guidelines. Planner Grahn thought they could talk about the rhythm and scale of the openings. There were large window expanses that would not be typically seen and should be broken up. They could also talk about the shape of the building, which was very 1970s and did not relate at all to the historic structure next to it. Planner Grahn stated that a good rule of thumb is to look at the lines of the building and now they carry through. In this particular addition the lines do not carry through from the historic to the new.

Board Member Stephens agreed that it was a rhythm and pattern issue, and he pointed out that the sense of entrance was lost.

Director Erickson thought it was instructive because some of the new buildings have recently been approved with larger out-of-scale windows, and the problem is being repeated. It was important for the HPB to understand that the rhythm and scale of windows on some of the buildings had not been applied as rigorously as it should be. What happened in the 1970s happened again in 2014.

Board Member Melville stated that the addition did not look compatible with the historic structure and it did not contribute to the sense of the Historic District.

### 1040 Woodside Avenue

Planner Grahn presented a photo of 1040 Woodside Avenue, which was new construction. Board Member Melville thought the Guidelines restricted concrete driveways to no more than 12' wide. She believed the driveway on this property was much wider. She asked when this structure was constructed. Planner Grahn was unsure of the year, but she thought it looked fairly new.

Chair White did not think this structure would have been approved in the last three years. Board Member Holmgren thought the garage was quite overwhelming. Chair White noted that a double garage would not be allowed under the Guidelines. Planner Hannah Turpen did not believe this structure was approved under the current guidelines. She pointed out that the purpose of this exercise was to get a feel for the entire streetscape. Ms. Melville remarked that some of the recent projects being proposed are similar. Planner Grahn remarked that in some cases two garage doors can fit, but the oversized concrete driveway in this example would definitely not be approved.

Board Member Stephens remarked that the slope of the roof was not consistent with most of the historic buildings in town. He pointed out that the large post and beam structure over the front entrance was a look typically seen in the Deer Valley part of Park City but not in historic structures. Mr. Stephens did not believe all buildings should be made to look old, but the historic design elements were not being honored in this building.

Board Member Beatlebrox recalled that when she took the photo, the mass and scale was compatible with the neighboring structures. However, she agreed that it did have the look of a Deer Valley ski lodge as opposed to an Old Town look.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if the gable was corrugated metal. Planner Grahn thought it was. Board Member Beatlebrox remarked that corrugated metal may have been a mining material. Board Member Melville replied that corrugated metal would not have been used on residential structures.

Board Member Stephen stated that typical a historic structure would not have a stone veneer. He did not think the stone veneer added anything to the structure of the house. In terms of the historic house, any stonework would have been structural. Planner Grahn clarified that the Guidelines limit stone to approximately two feet and primarily as a foundation material.

Board Member Melville thought the biggest problem was the amount of concrete and how it affected the streetscape. Board Member Hodgkins believed the primary objection was that it had more of a suburban look as opposed to a village look. He asked if they were trying to revise the Guidelines to replicate what exists. He was concerned that if they limit it to what was historically used, they would end up with a lot of historic replication. Board Member Melville clarified that they were looking for compatibility with the Historic District.

Planner Grahn thought the Board members were making good comments and providing good direction. She understood there was concern about wide driveways and large garages. Based on their comments they wanted to see more of a pedestrian entrance versus an automotive entrance, because that would be more historic. Some of these high level items could be amped up in

Guidelines to avoid situations that become more suburban and more auto centric and less pedestrian.

Board Member Melville recognized that people who develop projects like this have cars and they want driveways and garages. Planner Grahn pointed out that the LMC also requires that new construction provide two parking spots.

Director Erickson asked if they ignored the garage doors and the entry way, whether the single story height of the building and the gable would fit into the rhythm and scale of the District. Board Member Beatlebrox thought it would. Ms. Melville thought it would on a downhill lot. Director Erickson believed this example was a double-lot situation or at least a lot and a half. He thought their comments were instructive to the Staff in terms of rhythm and scale.

### 633-639 Park Avenue

Planner Grahn presented photos of the condos at 633-639 Park Avenue. Board Member Melville understood that Ms. Beatlebrox did not like the condos; however, she always sees tourists taking pictures of the condos from the top of Heber Avenue because they appear to be classic Park City. Board Member Beatlebrox explained that she finds the condos overbearing because they are so close to the road and overhangs jut out into the streetscape. They have a repetitive cookie cutter look with a repetitive railing, and a stone façade.

Board Member Stephens noted that Kevin King designed the buildings and the zone height is higher than anywhere else in town. Therefore, the mass is always going to be off because of the zone height. Ms. Melville remarked that even though it was not the classic old look and it does not replicate a historic look, she personally thought it fits in. She believes her opinion is verified by the number of people who stop to take pictures.

Board Member Holmgren thought the buildings were fine in that location. She would not want to see them next door to her home or across the street, but they were appropriate on the corner where they sit.

Chair White thought the location was overwhelming because there is too much there and most of it is the same. Ms. Melville pointed out that just up the hill was a larger, older version, which makes the condos at 633-639 Park Avenue not quite so overwhelming.

Board Member Hodgkins assumed that a variance was not needed for the amount of square footage that was built. Planner Grahn was unsure. Board Member Stephens replied that the square footage complied with Code. Mr. Hodgkins pointed out that the structure could have been much larger. He used 537 Woodside as an example of what could have been done in this location. Mr.

Hodgkins noted that there were other infill structures closer to Main Street that were much more massive. He thought the condos at 633-639 Park Avenue tend to have smaller scale elements. If the developer was allowed to build that much square footage the HPB should consider that when they revise the design guidelines. If they want something smaller, they should recommend a zone change to achieve a smaller scale. However, in terms of the size that is allowed in the zone, Mr. Hodgkins believed the condos were compatible.

Director Erickson commented on the charismatic elements to the architecture. He asked Planner Grahn to talk about how the windows would or would not be compatible in rhythm and scale. Planner Grahn stated that the windows are double-hung, which is in keeping with the historic district. The windows may be too large, and she was bothered by the fact that the windows were slightly taller than the door. She thought the developer did a nice job with the materials and the railings. There was a nod toward more ornate posts, but she liked how they tried to scale it back. Planner Grahn thought Ms. Beatlebrox had raised a good point about a repetitive cookie-cutter look. That was something the Staff and the Board needed to address in the Guidelines to avoid having every lot on the street look the same.

Director Erickson pointed to how the garage was handled under the reddish building and the stone work, as well as the garage door itself. In this particular case 20% of the garage door face is glass, which will allow light to come out of the garage door. Mr. Erickson was comfortable with the garage door. Ms. Melville thought the recessing of the garage door was very helpful, as opposed to having the garage door straight on the sidewalk. Chair White agreed that because of the recessing the garage door becomes secondary.

Board Member Hodgkins asked why they would allow glass in any garage doors. Mr. Erickson replied that it was a trade-off. To some degree one band of windows adds interest and it keeps from having to always turn the light on in the garage. However, the opposite is worse. Mr. Erickson was willing to discuss it if the HPB preferred not to have glass glazing in garage doors.

Board Member Stephens referred to the house at 633 Park Avenue and he thought the garage door underneath should not have windows because the idea is to keep the garage from being visible. However, if he were building new construction on a 25' x 75' lot, he would want to honor the designs that were going on in Old Town, but he would also want to build a house that is more reflective of today. The elements to work with would be limited, but one of those elements would be a garage door. Mr. Stephens would like to have flexibility in his garage doors if that was all he had to work with to add architectural interest to the home. He was not in favor of clear glass, but a frosted glass that diffuses the light would work.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff was trying to prevent big blobs of garage light going down the street at night. Ms. Melville pointed out that an all glass door would not look compatible with the historic district. Mr. Stephen disagreed. He thought that new architecture could honor the designs of the past with roof forms and patterns of windows and doors.

The Board discussed lot size, garage doors and house frontage. Director Erickson reminded the Board that a primary guiding principle is rhythm and scale. He thought they might be able to address part of the garage door issue by watching the rhythm and scale, windows to door ratios, and openings on the fronts of the buildings. He emphasized that the Staff was focused on the issue of rhythm and scale in terms of roofs and windows. Mr. Erickson commented on negotiations that took place on one project for a more contemporary look. They had not yet seen the results of that negotiation.

Director Erickson suggested that they table this discussion and move on to the next example. Planner Grahn stated that they could have a more in-depth discussion when they reach that point in the Guideline revisions.

#### 1034 Woodside Avenue

The next photo was 1034 Woodside Avenue. Board Member Hodgkins thought this garage door was the same as the last one. He believed they would have a completely different reaction if the photograph was taken with the lights on inside of the garage. Mr. Hodgkins personally believed that garages are not historic to the neighborhood and they are not compatible. He understood that garages are currently allowed, and whether or not to allow garages was not part of the discussion this evening. Mr. Hodgkins expressed his preference to eliminate all glazing because it does not fit with the size and dimensions of a window, and the garages should appear to be more subterranean.

Board Member Melville looked at it from the standpoint of not wanting to turn on a light every time you go into the garage. Mr. Hodgkins pointed out that almost every garage has a light that turns on automatically whenever the door is opened. Ms. Melville clarified that she was talking about walking from the house into the garage.

Board Member Stephens thought the question was why the architect for 1034 Woodside recessed the garage door. If they looked at the plans he believed they would find that the property line was close to the house and the architect had to recess the garage to accommodate a second car. Otherwise, the developer would have tried to maximize the footprint and pull the garage out to the front. He pointed out that the City could not regulate that and force the developer to push back the garage. Ms. Melville thought the City could require the developer to push it back a little.

Director Erickson asked if the City regulates the depth of the garage frontage. Planner Grahn replied that it is done on a case by case basis. The only requirement is to provide two parking spots on-site; and they can either be exterior or interior or a combination of both. At that point the Code regulates the dimensions. Planner Grahn agreed with Mr. Stephens that the garage was recessed so they could get one car in the garage and one car in the driveway.

Mr. Stephens felt this particular house was honoring the architecture of Southern California rather than the architecture of Park City. Board Member Beatlebrox remarked that this house has the same scale and mass as the neighboring house. It has greenery in the front and a repetitive shape. Ms. Beatlebrox thought the questions was whether or not it was compatible with the rest of the neighborhood. It is a modern house and not a historic home. She was unsure how they could legislate taste and tell people what they can or cannot have.

City Council Member, Cindy Matsumoto, stated that if the requirement for two parking spots was an issue, she thought the current City Council might be willing to look at changing the Code to require one parking spot to potentially reduce the number of cars in Park City. Ms. Melville was concerned that people would be parking all over the street if the on-site parking was reduced. She did not believe it would reduce the number of cars. Ms. Matsumoto replied that it goes with the idea of under parking the area to discourage people from bringing a car. If it would help create better design, she thought it was something the City Council might consider. Ms. Matsumoto clarified that it was only a suggestion. She agreed that reducing the on-site requirement could cause other problems.

Ms. Matsumoto stated that she was bothered by the pitch of the roof on this particular house at 1034 Woodside. Ms. Melville agreed, but she thought it was minor compared to some of the other things they were seeing.

Chair White thought the roof looked less shallow than what the Guidelines propose. He was not thrilled with the design of the house, but recessing the garage door rather than having it right at the street was a positive aspect. Ms. Melville agreed.

Board Member Hodgkins noted that they were not talking about the character zones that were presented at the last meeting. What they were looking at today were straight shots of a single building. It seems compatible with the streetscape given the tiny sliver they were seeing in terms of what was adjacent. He thought it was important to consider how the photo shown fits with the entire streetscape and what already exists. Mr. Hodgkins believed the Board was reacting to each photo in the broader context of the entirety of Old Town. He thought they needed to keep in mind the different character zones that were previously discussed.

Ms. Melville suggested that it would be helpful to take these addresses and walk the street to get a feel of how the building fits with the neighborhood.

### 801 Park Avenue

Planner Grahn presented a photo of 801 Park Avenue. She noted that the red building was the historic portion, the all glass transitional element was the transition, and the corrugated metal was the new addition.

Board Member Melville noted that there were eight buildings on the site. Planner Grahn asked the Board to focus the discussion on what was in the picture and not on the entire site and how it was developed.

Board Member Hodgkins thought this addition fit better than the example with the 1970s addition in terms of keeping the fenestration aligned across. He liked the fact that there was a clear delineation between what was historic and was it not. Board Member Hodgkins assumed many people would object to the square mass of the addition, but he did not object to the transition piece being glass because it sets it apart. He would have liked the addition to be more compatible in materials. Board Member Hodgkins thought the question was whether the mass of the addition was too big and the materials too different.

Board Member Melville thought it looked like a factory shed. Standing back and looking at the red house and the one up the hill, it was not quite so overwhelming, but it was still not a great transition.

Board Member Stephens remarked that in terms of patterns and rhythm on the street, he thought the new addition might have been more successful if the pattern of windows were more reflective to the size and scale of the historic building.

Director Erickson asked the Board to look at the party deck, the gazebo and the roof element. While they consider whether or not to continue to allow those types of things, he would ask Planner Turpen to talk about glazing and transitional elements. Mr. Erickson pointed to the utility box in the front yard and noted that the regulations were being changed to find better locations. He also asked the Board to consider whether the fence was affecting their overall vision of how this fits together. Board Member Melville thought the fencing made it look more like a factory. Mr. Erickson felt that it closed off the neighborhood.

Planner Turpen assumed the HPB remembered a conversation about determining the size of the transitional element. She noted that often times people only want to go in six inches before starting the transitional element. A constant battle between the Staff and the applicants is how much is enough. The Staff prefers something that is offset three or four feet in from the outside wall

and much lower than the high peak so it is subordinate and smaller than the rear wall and shorter than the tallest peak of the historic structure. Planner Turpen asked the Board for their thoughts on that type of regulation.

Board Member Beatlebrox thought it was important. She cautioned the Board to remember that they were looking at the side and not the front of the structure. The integrity of the historic structure is kept on the front. Therefore, from Park Avenue it looks good, but she agreed that it looks industrial from the side.

Board Member Holmgren thought chain link was prohibited in Old Town. Planner Grahn replied that she was correct. However, she was unsure whether the fence was chain link or a wire mesh material. Director Erickson noted that the Board could recommend prohibiting this type of wire mesh and replace it with vertical slat metal or other materials besides wood. The problem is that they are modern, contemporary materials. Board Member Melville agreed that it would not suggest compatibility with the historic.

Board Member Holmgren stated that she grew up on Guam and chain link was part of their life. However, they learned that painting it dark green or black almost made it invisible. She was opposed to chain link, but they could allow wire mesh as long as it is painted to minimize the visibility.

Board Member Hodgkins had an issue with the height of the fence. It did not appear friendly and he asked if the Board would consider regulating heights. Board Member Melville thought there were height requirements for fences along the sidewalk. Planner Grahn replied that it is a maximum of 4 feet and anything higher must be approved by the Planning Director and the City Engineer. Board Member Holmgren thought the fencing was high to keep in a dog. She assumed it was a dog kennel because of its location.

Board Member Stephens understood that fences could be six feet in the back and three feet in the front. This was a side yard and he was unsure of the height restriction for a side yard. He pointed out that for this building there was no back yard because of the zoning. The location of the fence is actually the only outdoor space other than the deck above. Mr. Erickson remarked that the groundscape was awkward and varied all the way through. In the upcoming Guidelines he would like to discuss groundscape and transitions.

### 943 Woodside

Planner Grahn presented a photo showing new construction at 943 Woodside. Board Member Hodgkins liked the garage. Planner Grahn asked what they thought about the garage being on such a long flat wall. She asked if they would like it better if there was another deck projecting above it to conceal it even more.

Board Member Hodgkins thought another deck would help with the mass and scale across the front. Board Member Melville assumed that the garage would eventually be demolished. Board Member Stephens thought it was missing rhythm and pattern.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if this structure met the 40 year requirement. Board Member Melville like how they were painting the duplex, triplex and fourplex different colors because it looked so much better. Board Member Hodgkins noted that it was similar to what was done at 537 Woodside. Ms. Melville hoped that would never occur again. Mr. Hodgkins pointed out that it was similar in that it was painted in three sections.

### 1021 and 1027 Woodside

Planner Grahn requested that the HPB look at both structures together. She noted that the garage doors were hidden, which is what the Board likes. She asked about the mass and scale.

Board Member Hodgkins asked if both structures were done at the same time. Planner Grahn was unsure. Board Member Stephens stated that there were actually four structures that were done by the same architect. In addition to these two it was also the historic blue house to the left. He recalled that the approval was denied because all four structures looked too similar and they were redesigned. Mr. Stephens pointed out that the difference was in smaller elements to make the structures look different.

Board Member Stephens remarked that the pattern of windows and spaces were inconsistent. Board Member Melville noted that the driveways get worse as it goes further down the hill. Director Erickson pointed out that this house and the previous house had cutouts in the corners to reduce the bulk and scale. He asked if the Board was comfortable with the smaller rectangular ones versus the larger ones in the previous home, or whether they should be eliminated entirely. Board Member Melville remarked that there was a lot of concrete in the front besides the driveway. Chair White stated that the approach stairs were not compatible with the District at all. He thought they should be narrower and turned a little.

Board Member Stephens asked how the dormers are addressed in terms rhythm and mass. Planner Grahn thought it depended on how close they were to the front wall plane. If a dormer is set back far enough it would not be so overwhelming. I would also help if it was broken up into multiple dormers as opposed to one giant wall. Planner Grahn noted that the dormers help achieve the gable and the higher ceilings without creating a chunkier rectangular mass. Mr. Stephens remarked that when a dormer on the second level flows all the way through to the first level without a break, it makes the mass too large. He thought

that goes back to rhythm and mass. He pointed out that traditionally a dormer would still have an eave coming out on it. In this particular case they did not even try to fake that appearance. Planner Grahn clarified that he was talking about the teal colored house. Mr. Stephens answered yes, but his comments also applied to the structure to the north.

Planner Turpen remarked that on historic homes they do not allow the wall plane to continue down from the dormer. It is required to be setback and lower than the ridge of the historic main gable roof. She was unaware of any recent new construction that has tried to do a dormer. Planner Grahn stated that there has been some but they were able to break it up so the dormer fits in and it becomes more of a bungalow design.

Board Member Stephens remarked that the intent is to give the Staff the tools they need to work with the applicant, particularly when an element does not work, and to make it clear so the Legal Department does not have to defend their decision.

Chair White remarked that under the current Code the third floor is required to be 10 feet back. He believed that requirement would help both of these structures significantly.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that given that these structures are located on Woodside in the residential neighborhood, and how far they are set back from the street, there was no space left for landscaping. If there was landscaping he believed it would help soften the buffer between the street and the house itself. He suggested that they might be objecting to the width of the stairs because they were so present due to the lack of landscaping space.

#### 1063 Norfolk Avenue

Planner Grahn stated that 1063 Norfolk was a renovation of a historic house. Board Member Melville noted that the HPB had awarded a grant for the renovation. Planner Grahn remarked that the concrete foundation was a new basement addition and everything above it was the historic house. She noted that the owners did a lot of work to bring back the box bay windows and other historic features. For the purpose of this discussion, she requested that the Board focus only on the addition.

Board Member Melville stated that in her opinion the owners renovated a historic house and finished it off with modern elements at the street level. She noted that the concrete, the glass door and the garage door could be seen from the street. Instead of stone retaining walls they put in metal plates that were not used in any historic era. Ms. Melville thought it detracted from the historic structure. She thought the addition on the back was fine and it looked good from the side

coming down the steps. Her issue was how it looked in the front at the street level because it did not look like a historic house.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she had submitted this photo with an A rating because she thought it was new construction. She was shocked to find that it was an old historic building. Ms. Beatlebrox was bothered by the garage and the window treatment on the right-hand.

Board Member Melville did not think the dormer fit with the house. Ms. Beatlebrox agreed. She also did not like the light fixtures dropping down. Ms. Beatlebrox did like the entry with the broader stairs.

Director Erickson asked if the Board would be comfortable allowing the metal detail on concrete for a new home in the District. Board Members Beatlebrox, Holmgren and Stephens answered yes. Ms. Melville stated that she would not like it for new construction.

Director Erickson asked about doing the same thing on a historic home. Board Member Hodgkins thought it detracted from the historic nature of the building. He could not look at the building without staring at the modern piece, and he had difficulty even seeing the historic building. Director Erickson clarified that exposed concrete under a historic house was not acceptable, and the metal plate architectural detail should be discouraged in the guidelines for a historic home. Ms. Melville remarked that it was very modern hardscaping.

Board Member Stephens stated that the City was encouraging people to lift the historic homes and put in a garage. If that is the intent, the garage is new construction and they need to find a way to bring the old and the new together and compatible. In this example he thought the entrance was done very well. He personally liked the rust to break up the concrete. He pointed out that the concrete was new and the house was lifted. There is a new additional below and it is awkward to lift up a house. However, Mr. Stephens did not believe there was enough of a break between the historic house sitting on top and the concrete down below. He thought there should have been a plank going around the house to make the house feel like it was finished and separated from what was below.

Planner Grahn understood that the HPB wanted to make sure new foundations that are exposed are separated from the historic house. She agreed that if they could get the garage set back underneath the cross wing it would be less visual.

#### 920 Empire and 916 Empire

Planner Grahn noted that both were contemporary houses that were recently finished. Board Member Melville thought the house on the right looked better

than the house on the left. She thought both structures looked okay in person from the street, and there was landscaping and less concrete.

Director Erickson noted that the building on the left was a different treatment of the garage doors. The garage door is almost in the face plane of the building, but it is recessed under the deck. There is some light at the door and it is a completely different door pattern than the contemporary doors previously shown. Director Erickson pointed out how the railing handles the deck.

Board Member Holmgren liked it. Board Member Beatlebrox rated it a B because the mass and scale was compatible with the rest of the neighborhood. She liked the tree in front of the door. Ms. Beatlebrox thought the modern elements made it clear that it was new construction and not a historic building. She was not opposed to the garage door.

Board Member Hodgkins was comfortable with it, but he preferred something that looked more pedestrian friendly. It may be the angle of the picture, but it appeared like you were staring directly into the garage door from the street. Ms. Hodgkins thought the pedestrian entrance coming and going seems secondary.

Planner Grahn asked for comments on 916 Empire. Board Member Melville thought this house came across a little better than the one at 920 Empire. Director Erickson pointed out that these were basically the same home with repetition in architecture. The only thing different was the football looking deck railing. Mr. Erickson thought the scale was good and the comments relative to the front door were appropriate. Board Member Melville thought the building on the right looked like two large garage doors across the front. Board Member Hodgkins thought it looked like the driveway was on a large slope. Board Member Beatlebrox replied that there was a slight slope to the driveway.

#### 951 Woodside Avenue

Planner Grahn stated that this home was a historic preservation. She assumed the gable projecting over the porch roof was probably a new addition. Planner Grahn asked what the Board thought about the proximity of the gable to the peak of the roof.

Board Member Hodgkins stated that he did not mind the gable, but it would have been better in a different color to give the appearance of a different building. Board Member Melville like this one better than 1063 Norfolk because there were planter beds instead of concrete. Mr. Hodgkins agreed that the landscaping made it better. He also liked the fact that you were not staring straight down the driveway. Ms. Melville liked how the new foundation was not so prominent.

Planner Grahn presented the last example, which was new construction. She thought it was evident that they tried to tie modern with the flat roof garage. Board Member Hodgkins asked if the garage was built at the same time or if it was an addition. Planner Grahn did not think it was an addition. Board Member Stephens remarked that the property to the north will be condos. Chair White thought it looked like a party deck over the garage. Planner Grahn assumed the wall was tall for protection against the hot tub.

Board Member Melville recalled that this structure was completed in 2009. Board Member Hodgkins remarked that he asked if the garage was an addition because it looked “weird”, as though it was built at a different time. He thought it looked like the house was added in the 1950s and the garage was added later. Ms. Melville remarked that there were three buildings and they all had a mix of corrugated metal and wood. She thought it was a pseudo-industrial design look. Mr. Hodgkins asked if that was a bridge to the garage. Board Member Stephens answered yes. He explained that what they were not seeing in the photo was a stairway down to the main level.

Director Erickson thought this was a good example of how they regulate for height on downhill slopes and getting the single story no higher than 35 feet. He pointed out that the regulation was generally working. Mr. Erickson stated that the garage was complicated but the height of the building seems to stay in the rhythm and scale.

Planner Grahn had no other examples to present.

Board Member Melville had prepared a handout with photos that she had taken of specific structures. She started with historic house renovations that she thought were particularly well-done.

The first home was the red house at 575 Park Avenue. It was renovated in 2010 and there was an addition on the back that was not visible from the front. There was no garage and only a driveway, which she thought was nice on Park Avenue.

The second home was 68 Prospect. There was no garage, but there is a side lot that could accommodate a garage. Ms. Melville stated that the house was really deteriorated before it was renovated. She noted that that there is a huge addition on the side that is not noticeable.

The third photo was 146 Main Street, which in her opinion, was the gold standard of a historic renovation. The garage was added on the side, the house looks great. There was a large addition on the back but from the street level the structure retains its character.

The next photo was 343 Park Avenue. This renovation was recently completed. A garage was not added. A large addition to the back was barely visible. She noted that the owner added a lower level but the front was not altered.

The next photo was the yellow house at 147 Ridge Avenue. It was one of her gold standards. An addition was added to the right and there was a middle connector. The white house was actually the garage but it appeared to be all one. Ms. Melville pointed out that the little yellow cottage was still on the ridge.

The next photo was 1049 Park Avenue. This project was finished this year and she thought it was very well done. Ms. Melville noted that a similar project down the street had caused the Planning Department a lot of trouble. She had recommended 1049 Park Avenue for the preservation award because it was done nicely without a trouble.

Ms. Melville presented photos of 901 Norfolk which was recently finished. She thought it turned out pretty well except for the large amount of concrete in the front. Planner Grahn explained that when they lifted the house it would have left a lot more of the foundation exposed. She believed that once they put in some plantings it would retain more of the hillside look. Ms. Melville thought plantings would help but she still thought the concrete was overwhelming. In her opinion it would have looked better if they had faced it with stone. She thought it had a good street presence with the exception of the concrete.

The next photo was 964 Empire. Ms. Melville stated that she was unsure when it was done but he has always admired this building. Board Member Stephens stated that it was done in 2006. Ms. Melville recalled that the building was moved up the hill and turned. It has a garage on the side and a lawn in the front. She thought the addition was a gold standard of a nice addition.

Board Member Melville had photos of the project in process at 264 Ontario. She thought it was looking good. Chair White was the architect and it would be completed in January. Ms. Melville noted that the little old house in the front still looks like the same house it always was. Mr. White remarked that the addition is a slightly different color to differentiate the old from the new. He noted that there was a transition piece that does not show on the photo.

Board Member Melville presented photos of examples where she thought the historic house was overwhelmed by the addition. One was at 429 Park Avenue. She noted that the green house on the right was the historic house and there was a giant house behind it that keeps it from looking like a historic house.

Ms. Melville noted that on 80 King Road the orange part was the little old house, but they built a new house all around it. Chair White pointed out that the orange

part was originally a shed and it was all that was there. Ms. Melville did not believe the structure retained any sense of historic.

Board Member Melville presented photos of what she thought were poor examples of historic renovation because it was difficult to identify the historic house. One example was 435 Park Avenue. There was large stone at the lower level and there was no entrance to the house from the street. Ms. Melville had the same complaint with 124 Daly. It was recently completed and she was unable to identify the historic house from any angle. Chair White remarked that the only historic piece that was there was the little gable on the left. Mr. Stephens agreed that there was only a flat wall and no building. Ms. Melville presented photos of 41 Sampson which had a nice setting with a little house down below. Now you only see the garage on the left instead of the house. She could not find the historic house in this structure. Board Member Melville referred to the garage at 109 Woodside and understood that it received a grant years ago. She pointed out that it was a historic shed that was rebuilt, but it looks like a brand new garage with no sense of history.

Board Member Melville presented photos of structures with incompatible features. The first was 1063 Norfolk which the Board discussed earlier in terms of incompatible features. She commented on the structure at 528 Park Avenue had pointed to the crank out windows on the south side that were incompatible.

Board Member Melville presented photos of new construction that she thought were compatible. The first was 819 Empire, which she thought fit nicely with the historic neighborhood. The next photo was a new duplex at 1110 and 1114 Empire which was for sale. She noted that the buildings looked better in person than in the photo. She thought they had done a good job considering it was a duplex. Another recently completed project was 1016 Lowell, which was for sale. Ms. Melville thought the structure fits in because it is small in scale on the front but has a large addition on the side. She thought the reconstruction at 109 Main fit in well with Old Town. Board Member Stephens noted that the historic building was torn down and a similar structure was built on the same footprint.

Board Member Melville presented photos of other new construction that she thought was compatible, which included 108 Park Avenue and 206 Swede Alley. Ms. Melville stated that she was on the fence as to whether the building at 520 Park Avenue fits with Old Town. It goes down the hill fairly well and it only has one garage. However, it looks very large from the side and there is another level below the street. She thought it looked more like a suburban house from the front; however she was not opposed to it.

Board Member Melville presented photos of structures that she thought were completely incompatible. One was the triplex at 537 Woodside that was turned into a single house. Another was 1134 Lowell which she did not think looked

compatible at all with the Historic District. Board Member Beatlebrox disagreed. She thought it was the right size and scale. She thought it was a cute little modern house. Ms. Melville thought the size and scale were right, and noted it was limited by the size of the lot. She remarked that it was clearly a contrasting house to the Historic District but in her opinion it was not compatible.

Director Erickson stated that looking at the home in context to the homes next to it, this one looks to be hiding behind the other homes. However, it is out of rhythm on the façade that effects how it works. He pointed to the rhythm and pattern of the windows underneath of the fascia and stated that if they did the Guidelines correctly it would be possible to do a better job of getting those windows in rhythm and scale with the rest of the neighborhood. Board Member Melville reiterated that she did not believe that 1134 Lowell fit with the Historic District. Board Member Hodgkins thought the garage door was done really well.

Board Member Melville thought 333 Main Street looked horrible on the Park Avenue side. She noted that in the past the only thing on the Park Avenue side was the back of the building and lots of large pine trees. After the reconstruction the Park Avenue side has decks, entrances, and a pullout. She questioned whether it was built to the same plans that were submitted to the Planning Department. She recalled that the plans showed a solid wall with the trees put back. Ms. Melville thought it was sad that a beautiful building became a large incompatible structure because it changed the character of the street.

Director Erickson stated that the Staff toured this section of Park Avenue last Wednesday and he thought the negative effect of green roofs as a mitigation for decks was evident. He believed there was no way to achieve a reasonable separation between the private spaces of the condo and the street with the green roof. Mr. Erickson stated that the most disturbing feature at night is the stairwell. It is 90 degree glass that is lit all night long.

Board Member Melville presented a photo of 411 Park Avenue and questioned how the structure was allowed to be so big. The third level does not step back and the garage is two massive. She looked at 1024 Norfolk several times and thought it looked like a modern tract house. It is too modern and the glass garage door does not fit. Chair White remarked that the scale and massing were compatible but that was all. Ms. Melville referred to 426 Woodside. At first she did not think it was too bad until they made the entire base concrete. Ms. Melville presented photos of 16 Sampson and 201 Norfolk. The green part was the old house with peak roofs. Construction was stopped for a while but the addition has a flat roof. Chair White stated that the right side was not historic. Ms. Melville understood that none of it was historic, but she wanted to know why they would put an addition on the left side with a flat roof that was not compatible with the existing structure on the right. She pointed out that all of the windows were ultra-modern and did not relate to the green house at all.

Board Member Melville presented a photo of Echo Spur and thought it was part of the green roof problem. A realtor sign advertises it as the “New Look of Old Town”. She asked if it was really compatible. Director Erickson stated that the Staff was working hard on trying to address flat roofs in the Historic District. He remarked that the Staff would come back to the HPB for a discussion regarding flat roofs. Mr. Erickson did not want party decks looking downhill into someone’s home.

Board Member Melville had included a photo of Fletchers because she thought it turned out well and fits with the street. Ms. Melville noted that the Old April Inn at 625 Main Street was being reconstructed. She thought it was unfortunate that the second level was being reconstructed into three large condos instead of the 12 hotel rooms that currently exist. Ms. Melville remarked that it was new construction that fits in and everyone uses it as an example of Classic Park City. She stated that there can be new construction on Main Street that does not look ultra-modern, and that is very classic and fits in.

Board Member Melville thought the Silver Queen and 625 Main Street was a beautiful building. It looks new but it fits with Main Street.

Ms. Melville did not think anyone would find 333 Main Street to be compatible with Main Street. It also contributes to the problem on Main Street because the large condos are not hot beds, and the large retail spaces could encourage large chain stores. Ms. Melville pointed out that 205 Main Street would eventually be nothing but garage doors. She thought these were two examples of very incompatible new buildings on Main Street.

Board Member Melville clarified that there were many more examples of buildings that were well-done that she had not included in her handout.

Director Erickson asked if the Board Members concurred with Ms. Melville’s assessment of the buildings she presented. Board Member Beatlebrox stated that she agreed with her assessment except for 1134 Lowell.

Director Erickson thanks the Board for their comments. He anticipated having a larger garage discussion as part of revising the Guidelines.

The meeting adjourned at 6:57 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_  
David White, Chair

Historic Preservation Board Meeting  
December 2, 2015

Historic Preservation Board