

# Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



**Subject:** Design Guideline Revisions  
**Author:** Anya Grahn, Planner  
Hannah Turpen, Planner  
**Date:** March 2, 2016  
**Type of Item:** Legislative  
**Project Number:** GI-13-00222

## **Summary Recommendations**

Staff has committed to routinely reviewing the existing Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites. The Planning Department requests the Historic Preservation Board open a public hearing, review the possible amendments to the *June 19, 2009 Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings*, and forward a positive recommendation regarding the staff's proposed changes as referenced in Exhibit C to City Council.

Staff requests that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) read and familiarize themselves with the existing Design Guidelines to prepare for this work session. The Design Guidelines are available online at:

<http://www.parkcity.org/Modules/ShowDocument.aspx?documentid=62>.

## **Background**

During the January 6, 2016, HPB meeting, staff discussed the history of the City's preservation efforts, the purpose of the Design Guidelines and their role as a living document, as well as differences between Federal, State, and local preservation regulations. Staff reminded the HPB that though our Design Guidelines are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction, the City does not enforce the Secretary of the Interior's Standards; we rely solely on the Design Guidelines. Our Design Guidelines identify four (4) treatment methods: Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction, which are often used in tandem depending on the condition of the structure and work to be completed. These terms are defined on page 6 of the Design Guidelines.

Staff began reviewing the Design Guidelines with the HPB in December 2014. Staff met with the HPB to discuss a potential outline for Design Guideline Changes in December 2014. Following this discussion, staff brought forward a work session regarding the treatment of historic structures to discuss panelization and reconstruction in February 2015. In September and October 2015, the HPB discussed compatibility of new additions. Staff also led a discussion with the HPB regarding character zones on October 7, 2015 and November 18, 2015. Starting in January 2016 and going forward, staff will be reviewing the Design Guidelines with the HPB on a monthly basis.

During the January 6, 2015, meeting, the HPB reviewed amendments to the following Design Guideline Sections:

- Universal Design Guidelines
- Site Design
  - Building Setbacks & Orientation
  - Topography & Grading
  - Landscaping & Vegetation
  - Retaining Walls
  - Fencing
  - Paths, Steps, Handrails & Railings (Not Associated with Porches)
  - Gazebos, Pergolas, and Other Shade Structures
  - Parking Areas & Driveways

The HPB continued the discussion to the February 3<sup>rd</sup> meeting and directed staff to bring back revisions to the Design Guidelines based on the HPB's feedback. On February 3<sup>rd</sup>, the discussion was continued to March 2<sup>nd</sup>.

Staff had originally recommended that the HPB spend the year reviewing and amending the Design Guidelines before meeting with City Council to pass a resolution to adopt these changes at the end of 2016. The HPB expressed concern that this timeframe was too onerous and asked staff to break the Design Guidelines into sections that could be reviewed with City Council prior to December 2016. Staff has considered the HPB's input and finds the following will aid in improving our efficiency and expedite our meeting with Council:

- Because of how the existing Design Guidelines are crafted, staff recommends that the HPB review the revised guidelines for Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Structures and Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Structures as these two (2) proposed sections will replace our Design Guidelines for Historic Sites chapter; we will then review these amendments with City Council in Summer 2016. Similarly, staff will bring forward the Design Guidelines for Infill Residential Construction and Design Guidelines for Infill Commercial Construction for HPB review before reviewing these sections with City Council in Winter 2016.
- Staff will strive to publish the staff report for Design Guideline amendments one week prior to publishing the entire HPB packet. This will provide board members additional time to review the amendments, find grammatical mistakes, and ask staff questions.
- During the January meeting, staff presented nine (9) subsections of the Design Guidelines to the HPB. Going forward, staff will be presenting a greater number of subsections for the HPB's review in order to expedite the process further. An updated calendar for reviewing these revisions is provided as Exhibit C.

### **Analysis**

Following January's meeting, staff has made several significant edits to the Design Guidelines reviewed by the HPB:

- Staff removed all the existing and proposed numbering to reduce confusion. The guidelines will be renumbered as part of the final document.

- The use of the phrase “historic building and structure” is repetitive. The Design Guidelines define a structure as “anything constructed, the Use of which requires a fixed location on or in the ground, or attached to something having a fixed location on the ground and which imposes an impervious material on or above the ground; definition includes “Building.” As the definition of structure already includes building, staff has simplified the Guidelines to only refer to a “structure” and not a “building and structure.”
- In the previously proposed changes, staff had incorporated the term “historic property.” As the existing Guidelines use the term “historic site,” staff has chosen to continue to use this term for consistency.
- Finally, staff has worked to correct grammatical errors, simplify wording, and make the proposed changes consistent.

Additionally, the Historic Preservation Board asked that staff return to discuss the definitions of “compatibility,” “subordinate,” and “complimentary”. The Land Management Code currently provides the following definitions:

- **COMPATIBLE OR COMPATIBILITY**. Characteristics of different Uses or designs that integrate with and relate to one another to maintain and/or enhance the context of a surrounding Area or neighborhood. Elements affecting Compatibility include, but are not limited to, Height, scale, mass and bulk of Building, pedestrian and vehicular circulation, parking, landscaping and architecture, topography, environmentally sensitive Areas, and Building patterns.
- **VISUAL COMPATIBILITY**. Characteristics of different architectural designs that integrate with and relate to one another to maintain and/or enhance the context of a surrounding Area or neighborhood. In addition to the elements effecting Compatibility which include, but are not limited to Height, scale, mass, and bulk of Building. Other factors that dictate compatibility include proportion of building’s front facade, proportion of openings within the facility; rhythm of solids to voids in front facades; rhythm of entrance or porch projections; relationship of materials and textures; roof shapes; scale of building.

The LMC and Design Guidelines do not define subordinate; however, the Oxford Dictionary defines it as lower in rank or position; of less or secondary importance. Further, Park City’s General Plan states:

“Per historic preservation practices, subordinate design refers to additions or new construction that is visually contiguous to a historic structure, yet reinforces the visual dominance of the historic structure. While a smaller addition is visually preferable to achieve subordinate design, various design strategies (e.g. underground SF, placement on lot, choice of materials) can achieve this goal despite the fact that the addition may contain greater SF than the historic structure.”

Similarly, the LMC and Design Guidelines do not define complementary; however, the Oxford Dictionary defines it as two things that are different but together form a useful or attractive combination of skills, qualities, or physical features

Staff finds that defining these terms requires a thorough discussion, which staff will incorporate into a work session for the Historic Preservation Board in April.

The following depicts the edits staff made following input from the HPB. The black text represents the existing Design Guideline; the underlined red is staff's amendments; and the blue represents the edits staff made following the HPB's discussion. Many of the edits we made were to make the language consistent throughout the Guidelines, correct grammatical errors, etc.

#### **A. Universal Design Guidelines:**

*4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved. Owners are encouraged to reproduce missing historic elements that were original to the building, but have been removed. Physical or photographic evidence should be used to substantiate the reproduction of missing features. In some cases, where there is insufficient evidence to allow for an accurate reconstruction of the lost historic elements, it may be appropriate to reproduce missing historic elements that are consistent with properties of similar design, age, and detailing ~~in some cases.~~*

*9. New construction—such as new additions, exterior alterations, repairs, upgrades, etc. — or related new construction should not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the historic site or building historic structure. ~~The new work~~ New construction should be differentiated from the historic structure or construction and should, at the same time, be compatible with the historic structure or construction in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment. ~~historic structure, the historic site, and its environment.~~*

#### **B. Site Design**

##### **BUILDING SETBACKS & ORIENTATION**

A.1.4 Maintain the existing front and side yard setbacks of historic sites.

A.1.2 Preserve the original location of the main entry of the historic structure, if extant.

~~A.1.3 Maintain the original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant.~~<sup>1</sup>

##### **TOPOGRAPHY AND GRADING**

A.5.8 2.1. Maintain the natural topography and original grading of the site when and where feasible.

---

<sup>1</sup> Relocated to "Paths, Steps, Handrails, ..."

A.5.3.2.2. The historic character of the site should not be significantly altered by substantially changing the proportion of built and/or paved area to open space, or and vice versa.

## **LANDSCAPING & ~~SITE GRADING~~ VEGETATION**

~~A.5.3.4~~ Respect and maintain historic existing landscape features that contribute to the historic character of the site and these existing landscape features that provide sustainability benefits.

~~A.3.2~~ Maintain established on-site native plantings on site. During construction, protect established vegetation during construction to avoid damage, and Replace damaged, aged, or diseased trees as necessary. Vegetation that may encroach upon or damage the historic building structure may be removed, but should be replaced with similar vegetation away from the historic building structure.

~~A.5.2~~ Incorporate landscape treatments for driveways, walkways, paths, building and accessory structures in a comprehensive, complimentary and integrated design.<sup>2</sup>

~~A.5.6 A.3.3~~ Provide a detailed landscape plan that respects, particularly for the front yard, areas viewable from the public right-of-way, that respects the manner and materials historically used traditionally in the historic districts. Consider all relationships on and with the site when planning for the long term sustainability of the landscape system. Relationships between site and building as well as between plants with other plants on site should be considered. When planning for the long-term sustainability of a landscape system, consider all landscape relationships on the site, the relationship between the site and its structure(s), as well as the relationship between plants and other plants on a site.

~~A.5.3.4~~ Landscape plans should balance water efficient irrigation methods and drought tolerant and native plant materials with existing plant materials and site features that contribute to the historic significance of the site.

~~A.3.6~~ Use to advantage existing stormwater management features, such as gutters and downspouts as well as site topography and vegetation, that contribute to the sustainability of the historic property site.

~~A.3.7~~ Where watering systems are necessary, use those which systems that minimize water loss, such as drip irrigation. Consider the use of xeriscaping or permaculture strategies for landscape design to maximize water efficiency; these systems should be designed to maintain the traditional historic character of the lot as viewed areas viewable from the public right-of-way.

~~A.5.5~~ Landscape plans should allow for snow storage from driveways.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Relocated to "Parking Areas and Driveways."

<sup>3</sup> Relocated to "Parking Areas and Driveways."

~~A.5.7 Provide landscaped separations between parking areas, drives, service areas, and public use areas including walkways, plazas, and vehicular access points.<sup>4</sup>~~

## **STONE RETAINING WALLS**

~~A.2.1 Maintain historic stone retaining walls in their original locations. Maintain the historic line height and setback of stone retaining walls along the street. Retaining walls of stone, concrete, or rock-faced concrete block that are original to a property the historic site should be preserved and maintained in their original dimensions.~~

~~A.2.2 Maintain the original dimensions of historic retaining walls.~~

~~Removing portions of retaining walls for new driveways and pathways should be avoided to the greatest extent possible, but where it must occur, visual impacts should be minimized.~~

~~A.2.2 Retaining walls should be repaired with materials which that closely approximate the original. Replace only those portions of historic stone retaining walls that have deteriorated beyond repair. When repair of a deteriorated feature retaining wall is not feasible, the replacement must reuse the existing stone where possible to the greatest extent possible, or and otherwise match the original in color, shape, size, material, and design.~~

~~A.2.3 To reduce failure of walls abate retaining wall failure; improve drainage behind them retaining walls so that water drains away from the walls. Preserve and repair Repair and preserve existing historic stone and mortar.~~

~~A.2.4 New retaining walls should be consistent with historic features retaining walls in design, materials, and scale of materials, as well as size and mass of the wall. Simple seered board-formed concrete, stone, and other historic materials are recommended over concrete block, asphalt, or other modern concrete treatments.~~

~~A.2.5 Non-extant historic retaining walls of brick, concrete or stone specific to the historic site may be reconstructed based on physical or pictorial evidence. or Historically appropriate concrete or stone walls, if consistent with the historic character of the district, may be added to the front of a property area of a historic site viewable from the public right-of-way if historically appropriate and consistent with the character of the district.~~

~~A.2.6 Maintain stone in its natural finish. It is not appropriate to paint, stain, or plaster over stone or concrete walls.~~

## **FENCES FENCING & HANDRAILS**

---

<sup>4</sup> Relocated to "Parking Areas and Driveways."

A.3.1 Maintain Historic fences fencing and handrails should be preserved and maintained.

A.3.2 Historic fences fencing and handrails may be reconstructed based on photographic evidence. The reconstruction should match the original in design, color, texture, and material. Wood picket fences with flat, dog ear, or pointed tops were typical in the front yard; the heights of these fences was generally less than three feet (3'), the boards were 3-1/2" wide and spacing of 1-3/4" between boards.<sup>5</sup>

A.3.3 New fences fencing and handrails should reflect the building's structure's style and period. New wood and metal fences fencing located in the front yard where viewable from the public right-of-way should feature traditional designs and patterns. Split or horizontal rail, railroad tie, or timber fences fencing may be located in rear yards where not viewable from the public right-of-way, but should be avoided in front yards where visible from the primary public right-of-way. Vinyl or plastic-coated fencing is not appropriate.

A.3.4 Design a new fence New fencing should be designed to minimize its environmental impacts. New fences fencing should use green materials and should take into account site impacts such as shading, natural topography, and drainage.

A.3.5 Wood fences should be painted using colors complementary to the adjacent house.<sup>6</sup>

A.3.6 Drought tolerant shrubs should be considered in place of a fence fencing or walls.

A.3.7 Arbors emphasizing a fence gate or entry shall be subordinate to the associated historic building or structure and shall complement the design of the historic structure and fence fencing in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and as well as massing to protect the integrity of the historic property site and its environment.

## **PATHS, STEPS, HANDRAILS, & RAILINGS (NOT ASSOCIATED WITH PORCHES)**

A.1.3 A.4.1 Maintain TThe original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant, should be maintained and preserved preserved and maintained.<sup>7</sup>

A.4.1 2 Maintain HHistoric hillside steps that may be are an integral part of the landscape should be maintained and preserved preserved and maintained.

A.4.3 New hillside steps should be visually subordinate to the associated historic building or structure in materials, size, scale and proportion, as well as massing

---

<sup>5</sup> The HPB recommended that this sentence be moved to a side-bar.

<sup>6</sup> The HPB requested that paint be addressed as part of a new section "Treatment of Historic Building Materials."

<sup>7</sup> Relocated from "Building Setbacks and Orientation"

and shall complement the historic structure in materials, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic ~~property site and its environment~~. For ~~larger longer-runs of~~ stairs, consider changes in material to break up the mass of the stairs.

A.4.4 Historic handrails should be ~~maintained and preserved~~ preserved and ~~maintained~~. Historic handrails may be reconstructed based on photographic evidence; the reconstruction should match the original in ~~size, design, color, texture, and material~~.

A.4.5 New handrails and railings shall complement the historic structure in materials, size, scale and proportions, ~~and massing and design to protect the integrity of the historic property structure and its environment site~~.

## **A.5. GAZEBOS, PERGOLAS, AND OTHER SHADE STRUCTURES**

A.5.1 Gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures ~~shall~~ should be visually subordinate to the associated historic ~~building or~~ structure(s) and ~~shall should~~ complement the design of the historic structure(s) in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic ~~structure and site property and its environment~~.

A.5.2 The installation of gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall be limited to rear or side yards and have limited visibility when viewed from the ~~primary~~ public right-of-way.

A.5.2. Gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall not be attached to the associated ~~building or~~ historic structure(s), nor damage historic features of ~~the associated or neighboring historic building(s) or structure(s)~~.

## **PARKING AREAS, ~~DETACHED GARAGES,~~ & DRIVEWAYS**

A.5.2 ~~A.6.1~~ Minimize the visual impacts of on-site parking by incorporating landscape treatments for driveways, walkways, paths, ~~building and accessory and~~ structures in a comprehensive, complimentary and integrated design.<sup>8</sup>

~~A.5.7~~ ~~A.6.2~~ Provide landscaped separations between parking areas, drives, service areas, and public use areas including walkways, plazas, and vehicular access points.<sup>9</sup>

~~C.1.3~~ ~~A.6.3~~ When locating new off-street parking areas, the existing topography of the ~~building~~ site and ~~significant~~ integral site features should be minimally impacted.

~~C.1.1~~ ~~A.6.4~~ Off-street parking areas should be located within the rear yard and beyond the rear wall plane of the primary structure where feasible. ~~C.1.2~~ If locating a parking area in the rear yard is not physically possible, the off-street parking area and associated vehicles should be visually buffered from adjacent

---

<sup>8</sup> Relocated from "Landscaping & Vegetation"

<sup>9</sup> Relocated from "Landscaping & Vegetation"

properties and the primary public right-of-way. Consider providing a driveway along the side yard of the property where feasible.

C.2.1 When locating driveways, the existing topography of the building site and significant site features should be minimally impacted.

C.2.2 Ten-foot (10') wide driveways are encouraged; however, new driveways should not exceed twelve feet (12') in width.

C.2.3 Shared driveways should be used when feasible.

A.6.5 Consider using textured and pour paving materials other than smooth concrete for driveways in the front yard viewable from the public right-of-way. Use Permeable paving should be used on a historic site, where appropriate, on a historic site to manage storm water. Permeable paving may not be appropriate for all driveways and parking areas.

A.6.6 Avoid paving up to the building foundation to reduce heat island effect, building temperature, damage to the foundation, and storm-water runoff problems.

A.5.5 Landscape plans should allow for Snow storage from driveways should be provided on site.

Going forward, staff will be reviewing our proposed guidelines with an editor prior to presenting them to the HPB to reduce confusion and reduce the number of modifications. Further, staff will be providing additional information to aid the HPB in understanding the reasoning behind staff's proposed modifications.

### **Recommendation**

The Planning Department requests the Historic Preservation Board open a public hearing, review the possible amendments to the *June 19, 2009 Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings*, and forward a positive recommendation regarding the staff's proposed changes as referenced in Exhibit C to City Council.

### **Exhibits**

Exhibit A – 1.6.16 HPB Report + Minutes

Exhibit B – Amendments to the Design Guidelines

## Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



**Subject:** Design Guideline Revisions  
**Author:** Anya Grahn, Planner  
 Hannah Turpen, Planner  
**Date:** January 6, 2016  
**Type of Item:** Regular Session  
**Project Number:** GI-13-00222

### Summary Recommendations

Staff has committed to routinely reviewing the existing Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites. Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) take public comment on the proposed changes to the *Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings*; provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a recommendation to City Council. (A final review of the Design Guideline changes will be requested prior to forwarding a recommendation to City Council.)

Staff requests that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) read and familiarize themselves with the existing Design Guidelines to prepare for this work session. The Design Guidelines are available online at:

<http://www.parkcity.org/home/showdocument?id=62>.

### Background

Historic preservation code provisions date back to approximately 1982. In the early 1990s, the City expanded regulations governing demolition of commercial properties, primarily on Main Street, and soon after extended protections to residential properties on the initial survey or over 50 years old, subject to a determination of significance hearing. In 2007, the City contracted Preservation Solutions to conduct a reconnaissance level, or "windshield," survey of the historic district. This increased our current preservation program in which some 400 sites and structures were designated as historic on the City's Historic Sites Inventory (HSI) and the adoption of the 2009 *Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites*. Owners of properties on the HSI may not demolish buildings or structures designated as historic unless warranted by economic hardship; however, reconstruction and panelization may be deemed necessary and approved by the Historic Preservation Board if specified criteria are met as defined in the LMC. The City has been successful in encouraging historic preservation through a "carrot and stick" approach, which includes the Historic District Grant Program and LMC exceptions benefitting historic properties.

### Purpose of the Design Guidelines

The Design Guidelines provide direction to property owners, architects, designers, builders, developers, City staff, the Historic Preservation Board (HPB), and City Council

in developing proposals that maintain the historic character of Park City's Old Town. The Design Guidelines fulfill policy directives provided in the General Plan and Land Management Code (LMC). Further, these guidelines are a foundation for making decisions and a framework for ensuring consistent procedures and fair deliberations.

The Design Guidelines were envisioned to be a living document. From time to time, the HPB may recommend changes in the Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historic Sites to Council, provided that no changes in the guidelines shall take effect until adopted by a resolution of the City Council. The Guidelines have not been reviewed or revised since their adoption in 2009.

### What do they do?

The Design Guidelines are a standard for rehabilitating historic structures, developing historic sites, and constructing new buildings in the commercial and residential neighborhoods of Old Town. The guidelines direct alterations and the design of new construction projects to maintain the historic integrity and character of our historic districts. This allows Park City to maintain its listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

### National versus Local Review

The Design Guidelines are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration, and Reconstruction. The Standards are a series of concepts about maintaining, repairing, and replacing historic materials, as well as designing new additions or making alterations. Park City's Design Guidelines offer general design and technical recommendations to assist in applying the Standards to a specific property. The Secretary of Interior's Standards are generally applied most specifically during tax credit projects, which are reviewed by the National Park Service. The City does not enforce the Secretary of the Interior's Standards; we rely solely on the Design Guidelines.

The Secretary of the Interior, as well as our Design Guidelines, identifies four (4) treatment methods:

- *Preservation*: The act or process of applying measures necessary to sustain the existing form, integrity, and materials of an historic property. Work, including preliminary measures to protect and stabilize the property, generally focuses upon the ongoing maintenance and repair of historic materials, and features rather than extensive replacement and new construction.
- *Rehabilitation*: The act or process of making possible a compatible use for a property through repair, alterations, and additions while preserving those portions or features which convey its historical, cultural, or architectural values.
- *Restoration*: The act or process of accurately depicting the form, features, and character of a property as it appeared at a particular period of time by means of the removal of features from other periods in its history and reconstruction of missing features from the restoration period.

- *Reconstruction*: The act or process of depicting, by means of new construction, the form, features, and detailing of a non-surviving site, landscape, building, structure, or object for the purpose of replicating its appearance at a specific period of time and in its historic location.

Often, a project will utilize several of these methods depending on the condition of the structure and work to be completed.

It is important to note that though our Design Guidelines are based on the Secretary of Interior's Standards, City staff does not utilize the federal standards specifically when reviewing applications.

### Past Reviews

Staff began reviewing the Design Guidelines with the HPB in December 2014. Staff met with the HPB to discuss a potential outline for Design Guideline Changes in December 2014. Following this discussion, staff brought forward a work session regarding the treatment of historic structures to discuss panelization and reconstruction in February 2015. In September and October, the HPB discussed compatibility of new additions. Staff also led a discussion with the HPB regarding character zones on October 7, 2015 and November 18, 2015.

### Analysis

In December 2014, staff presented a rough outline to the Historic Preservation Board for reorganizing the Design Guidelines (Exhibit A). Using this outline, staff has chosen to focus today's discussion on the following areas of concern within the *Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Structures*:

- Universal Guidelines
- Site Design

Staff has outlined the applicable Design Guidelines that apply to each subject matter. In reviewing Design Guidelines from other cities and towns—including Crested Butte, Colorado; Breckenridge, Colorado; Madison, Indiana; and the 1980 Park City, Utah, Design Guidelines—staff has proposed the following changes to the Park City Design Guidelines as a possible solution.

#### 1. Universal Design Guidelines:

The *Design Guidelines for Historic Sites* in Park City currently recommend the following Universal Design Guidelines:

1. *A site should be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to the distinctive materials and features.*
2. *Changes to a site or building that have acquired historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved.*
3. *The historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.*
4. *Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved. Owners are encouraged to reproduce missing historic elements that were original to the building, but have been removed.*

*Physical or photographic evidence should be used to substantiate the reproduction of missing features.*

*5. Deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration or existence of structural or material defects requires replacement, the feature or element should match the original in design, dimension, texture, material, and finish. The applicant must demonstrate the severity of deterioration or existence of defects by showing that the historic materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.*

*6. Features that do not contribute to the significance of the site or building and exist prior to the adoption of these guidelines, such as incompatible windows, aluminum soffits, or iron porch supports or railings, may be maintained; however, if it is proposed they be changed, those features must be brought into compliance with these guidelines.*

*7. Each site should be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Owners are discouraged from introducing architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design when no evidence of such elements or details exists.*

*8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials should not be used. Treatments that sustain and protect, but do not alter appearance, are encouraged.*

*9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the site or building.*

*10. New additions and related new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment could be restored.*

These Universal Design Guidelines are based on the Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation. Staff finds that overall these Universal Guidelines provide sufficient direction. Staff would recommend clarifying Universal Guideline #4 by adding language clarifying that owners may reproduce missing historic elements consistent with those seen on properties of similar design, age, and detailing. Staff also recommends that Universal Design Guideline #9 be amended to further reflect the Secretary of the Interior's Standards by clarifying that new additions should be differentiated from the historic structure but also compatible. These changes are outlined below:

*4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved. Owners are encouraged to reproduce missing historic elements that were original to the building, but have been removed. Physical or photographic evidence should be used to substantiate the reproduction of missing features. It may be appropriate to reproduce missing*

historic elements that are consistent with properties of similar design, age, and detailing in some cases.

9. New additions, exterior alterations, or related new construction should not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the site or building. The new work should be differentiated from the historic structure or construction and should be compatible with the historic structure or construction in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment.

## 2. Site Design

Currently, Specific Design Guidelines A. Site Design (pages 29-30 of the Design Guidelines) provides direction on Building Setbacks & Orientation, Stone Retaining Walls, Fences and Handrails, Steps, Landscaping & Site Grading. Based on the outline for the revised Design Guidelines (Exhibit A), staff has made several recommendations for reorganizing the Design Guidelines, introducing new subsections such as Topography and Grading; and Gazebos, Pergolas, and Other Shade Structures. Further, staff has added additional guidelines for Landscaping and moved Parking Areas to the Site Design Subsection.

Staff's proposed changes are outlined below in red:

### **A.1. BUILDING SETBACKS & ORIENTATION**

A.1.1 Maintain the existing front and side yard setbacks of Historic Sites.

A.1.2 Preserve the original location of the main entry, if extant.

~~A.1.3 Maintain the original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant.~~

### **A.2. TOPOGRAPHY AND GRADING**

~~A.5.8~~ 2.1. Maintain the original grading of the site when and where feasible.

~~A.5.3~~ 2.2. The historic character of the site should not be significantly altered by substantially changing the proportion of built or paved area to open space or vice versa. In

### **A.53 LANDSCAPING & SITE GRADING VEGETATION**

~~A.53.1~~ Respect and maintain historic landscape features that contribute to the character of the site and those that provide sustainability benefits.

~~A.3.2~~ Maintain established native plantings on site. Protect established vegetation during construction to avoid damage and replace damaged, aged, or diseased trees as necessary. Vegetation that may encroach upon or damage the historic building may be removed, but should be replaced with similar vegetation away from the historic building.

~~A.5.2~~ Incorporate landscape treatments for driveways, walkways, paths, building and accessory structures in a comprehensive, complimentary and integrated design.

~~A.5.6 A.3.3~~ Provide a detailed landscape plan, particularly for the front yard, that respects the manner and materials used traditionally in the districts. Consider all relationships on and with the site when planning for the long term sustainability of the landscape system. Relationships between site and building as well as between plants with other plants on site should be considered.

A.53.4 Landscape plans should balance water efficient irrigation methods and drought tolerant and native plant materials with existing plant materials and site features that contribute to the significance of the site.

~~A.3.6~~ Use to advantage existing stormwater management features, such as gutters, downspouts, as well as site topography and vegetation that contribute to the sustainability of the historic property.

~~A.3.7~~ Where watering systems are necessary, use those which minimize water loss, such as drip irrigation. Consider use of xeriscaping or permaculture strategies for landscape design to maximize water efficiency; these systems should be designed to maintain the traditional character of the lot as viewed from the public right-of-way.

~~A.5.5~~ Landscape plans should allow for snow storage from driveways.

~~A.5.7~~ Provide landscaped separations between parking areas, drives, service areas, and public use areas including walkways, plazas, and vehicular access points.

## **A.24 STONE RETAINING WALLS**

~~A.2.1~~ Maintain historic stone retaining walls in their original locations. Maintain the line of stone retaining walls along the street. Walls of stone, concrete, or rock-faced concrete block that are original to a property should be preserved and maintained in their original dimensions.

~~A.2.2~~ Maintain the original dimensions of historic retaining walls.

~~A.2.2~~ Walls should be repaired with materials which closely approximate the original. Replace only those portions of historic stone retaining walls that have deteriorated beyond repair. When repair of a deteriorated feature is not feasible, the replacement must reuse the existing stone where possible, or otherwise match the original in color, shape, size, and design.

~~A.2.3~~ To reduce failure of walls, improve drainage behind them so that water drains away from walls. Preserve and repair existing stone and mortar.

~~A.2.4~~ New retaining walls should be consistent with historic features in design, materials, and scale. Simple scored concrete, stone, other historic materials are recommended over concrete block, asphalt, or other modern concrete treatments.

~~A.2.5~~ Walls of brick, concrete, or stone may be reconstructed based on physical or pictorial evidence or added to the front of a property if historically appropriate and consistent with the character of the district.

~~A.2.6~~ Maintain stone in its natural finish. It is not appropriate to paint, stain, or plaster over stone walls.

## **A.3. FENCES & HANDRAILS**

A.3.1 ~~Maintain~~ Historic fences and handrails should be preserved and maintained.

A.3.2 Historic fences ~~and handrails~~ may be reconstructed based on photographic evidence. The reconstruction should match the original in design, color, texture, and material. Wood picket fences with flat, dog-ear, or pointed-tops were typical in the front yard; the heights of these fences was generally less than three feet (3'), the boards were 3-1/2" wide and spacing of 1-3/4" between boards.

A.3.3 New fences and handrails should reflect the building's style and period. New wood and metal fences located in the front yard should feature traditional designs and patterns. Split or horizontal rail, railroad tie, or timber fences may be located in rear yards but should be avoided in front yards visible from the primary public right-of-way. Vinyl or plastic-coated fencing is not appropriate.

A.3.4 Design a new fence to minimize its environmental impacts. New fences should use green materials and take into account site impacts such as shading, natural topography, and drainage.

A.3.5 Wood fences should be painted using colors complementary to the adjacent house.

A.3.6 Drought tolerant shrubs should be considered in place of a fence or wall.

A.3.7 Arbors emphasizing a fence gate or entry shall be subordinate to the associated historic building or structure and shall complement the design of the historic structure and fence in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment.

#### **A.4. PATHS, STEPS, HANDRAILS, & RAILINGS (NOT ASSOCIATED WITH PORCHES)**

~~A.1.3~~ A.4.1 ~~Maintain~~ The original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant, should be maintained and preserved.

A.4.4 ~~2~~ ~~Maintain~~ Historic hillside steps that may be an integral part of the landscape should be maintained and preserved.

A.4.3 New hillside steps should be subordinate to the associated historic building or structure and shall complement the historic structure in materials, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment. For larger runs of stairs, consider changes in material to break up the mass of the stairs.

A.4.4 Historic handrails should be maintained and preserved. Historic handrails may be reconstructed based on photographic evidence; the reconstruction should match the original in design, color, texture, and material.

A.4.5 New handrails and railings shall complement the historic structure in materials, size, scale, and proportions, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment.

#### **A.5. GAZEBOS, PERGOLAS, AND OTHER SHADE STRUCTURES**

A.5.1 Gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall be subordinate to the associated historic building or structure and shall complement the design of the historic structure in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment.

A.5.2 The installation of gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall be limited to rear or side yards and have limited visibility when viewed from the primary public right-of-way.

A.5.2. Gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall not attach to the associated building or structure, nor damage historic features of the associated or neighboring historic building(s) or structure(s).

### **C. A.6. PARKING AREAS, ~~DETACHED GARAGES~~, & DRIVEWAYS**

~~C.1.2~~ A.6.1 Minimize the visual impacts of on-site parking by incorporating landscape treatments for driveways, walkways, paths, building and accessory structures in a comprehensive, complimentary and integrated design.

~~A.5.7~~ A.6.2 Provide landscaped separations between parking areas, drives, service areas, and public use areas including walkways, plazas, and vehicular access points.

~~C.1.3~~ A.6.3 When locating new off-street parking areas, the existing topography of the building site and significant site features should be minimally impacted.

~~C.1.4~~ A.6.4 Off-street parking areas should be located within the rear yard and beyond the rear wall plane of the primary structure. ~~C.1.2~~ If locating a parking area in the rear yard is not physically possible, the off-street parking area and associated vehicles should be visually buffered from adjacent properties and the primary public right-of-way. Consider providing a driveway along the side yard of the property where feasible.

A.6.5 Consider using textured and pour paving materials other than smooth concrete for driveways in the front yard. Use permeable paving where appropriate on a historic site to manage storm water. Permeable paving may not be appropriate for all driveways and parking areas.

A.6.6 Avoid paving up to the building foundation to reduce heat island effect, building temperature, damage to the foundation, and storm-water runoff.

### **Recommendation**

Staff has committed to routinely reviewing the existing Design Guidelines for Historic Districts and Historic Sites. Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) take public comment on the proposed changes to the *Design Guidelines for Park City's Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings*; provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a recommendation to City Council. (A final review of the Design Guideline changes will be requested prior to forwarding a recommendation to City Council.)

### **Exhibits**

Exhibit A

## Outline of Proposed Restructuring and Modifications of Design Guidelines

Existing Design Guidelines	Proposed Design Guidelines
<p><b><u>Design Guidelines for Historic Sites</u></b>  <b>Universal Guidelines</b></p> <p><b>Specific Guidelines</b></p> <p><b>A. Site Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A.1. Building Setbacks &amp; Orientation</li> <li>A.2. Stone Retaining Walls</li> <li>A.3. Fences &amp; Handrails</li> <li>A.4. Steps</li> <li>A.5. Landscaping &amp; Site Grading</li> </ul> <p><b>B. Primary Structures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>B.1. Roofs</li> <li>B.2. Exterior Walls</li> <li>B.3. Foundations</li> <li>B.4. Doors</li> <li>B.5. Windows</li> <li>B.6. Mechanical Systems, Utility Systems, and Service Equipment</li> <li>B.7. Paint and Color</li> </ul> <p><b>C. Parking Areas</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>C.1 Off-Street Parking</li> <li>C.2. Driveways</li> <li>C.3. Detached Garages</li> </ul> <p><b>D. Additions to Historic Structures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>D.1. Protection for Historic Structures and Sites</li> <li>D.2. General Compatibility</li> <li>D.3. Scenario 1: Residential Historic Sites—Basement Addition without Garage</li> <li>D.4. Scenario 2: Residential Historic Sites—Basement Addition with Garage</li> </ul> <p><b>E. Relocation and/or Reorientation of Intact Buildings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>E.1. Protection for the Historic Site</li> </ul> <p><b>F. Disassembly/Reassembly of All or Part of a Historic Structure</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>F.1. General Principles</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Design Guidelines for Historic Residential Sites</u></b>  <b>Universal Guidelines</b></p> <p><b>Specific Guidelines</b></p> <p><b>Site Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Street Patterns and Streetscape</li> <li>• Building Setback and Orientation</li> <li>• Topography and Grading</li> <li>• Landscaping and Vegetation</li> <li>• Stone Retaining Walls</li> <li>• Fences</li> <li>• Steps and Handrails (Not associated with porch)</li> <li>• Gazebos, Pergolas, and Other Shade Structures</li> <li>• Parking (Areas and Driveways)</li> </ul> <p><b>Primary Structures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Foundation</li> <li>• Exterior Walls</li> <li>• Roofs</li> <li>• Doors</li> <li>• Windows</li> <li>• Porches</li> <li>• Gutters and Downspouts</li> <li>• Chimneys and Stove Pipes</li> <li>• Mechanical Systems</li> </ul> <p><b>Additions to Primary Structures</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of Historic Sites and Structures</li> <li>• General Compatibility</li> <li>• Basement Addition With Garage</li> <li>• Basement Addition Without Garage</li> <li>• Decks</li> </ul> <p><b>Historic Accessory Structures</b></p> <p><b>Character Zones</b></p>

- F.2. Documentation Requirements prior to the commencement of Disassembly
- F.3. Disassembly
- F.4. Protection of the Disassembled Components
- F.5. Reassembly

**G. Reconstruction of Existing Historic Structures**

**H. Accessory Structures**

**I. Signs**

**J. Exterior Lighting (Building Mounted)**

**K. Awnings**

**L. Sustainability**

**M. Seismic Upgrades**

**N. ADA Compliance**

**Supplemental Rehabilitation Guidelines**

**Main Street National Register Historic District**

**Design Guidelines for Historic Commercial Sites**

**Universal Design Guidelines**

**Specific Design Guidelines**

**Site Design**

- Street Patterns and Streetscape
- Building Setback and Orientation
- Topography and Grading
- Landscaping and Vegetation

**Primary Structure**

- Foundation
- Exterior Walls
- Roofs
- Store Fronts
- Doors (not included in Storefronts)
- Windows (not included in Storefronts)
- Balconies/Porticos
- Awnings
- Chimney and Stovepipes
- Mechanical Equipment

**Additions to Primary Structures**

- Protection of Historic Sites and Structures
- General Compatibility
- Basement Additions
- Balconies/Decks

**Historic Accessory Structures**

*\*\*\*Staff has chosen not to re-number the revised Guidelines in order to allow greater flexibility when reorganizing the revised guidelines in the future.\*\*\**

**Design Guidelines for New Construction in Historic Districts**

**Universal Design Guidelines  
Specific Design Guidelines**

**A. Site Design**

- A.1. Building Setbacks & Orientation
- A.2. Lot Coverage
- A.3. Fences
- A.4. Site Grading & Steep Slope Issues
- A.5. Landscaping

**B. Primary Structures**

- B.1. Mass, Scale, & Height
- B.2. Key Building Elements
  - Foundations
  - Roofs
  - Materials
  - Windows and Doors
  - Porches
  - Paint and Color
  - Mechanical and Utility Systems and Service Equipment

**C. Reconstruction of Non-Surviving Structures**

**D. Off-Street Parking Areas, Garages, & Driveways**

- D.1. Off-Street Parking Areas**
- D.2. Garages**
- D.3. Driveways**

**E. Signs**

**F. Awnings**

**G. Exterior Lighting**

**H. Accessory Structures**

**I. Sustainability**

**J. Mailboxes, Utility Boxes, and other Visual Elements in the Landscape**

**Supplemental Guidelines**

**Swede Alley**

**Main Street National Register Historic District**

**Design Guidelines for Infill Residential Development**

**Universal Guidelines**

**Specific Guidelines**

**Site Design**

- Street Patterns and Streetscape
- Sameness
- Building Setback and Orientation
- Topography and Grading
- Landscaping and Vegetation
- Stone Retaining Walls
- Fences
- Steps and Handrails (Not associated with porch)
- Gazebos, Pergolas, and Other Shading Structures
- Parking (Areas and Driveways)

**Primary Structures**

- Foundation
- Exterior Walls
- Roofs
- Doors
- Windows
- Porches
- Gutters and Downspouts
- Chimneys and Stove Pipes
- Mechanical Systems
- Decks
- Materials

**New Accessory Structures**

**Design Guidelines for Infill Commercial Development**

**Universal Design Guidelines**

**Specific Design Guidelines**

**Site Design**

- Street Patterns and Streetscape
- Building Setback and Orientation
- Topography and Grading
- Landscaping and Vegetation

### **Primary Structure**

- Foundation
- Exterior Walls
- Roofs
- Store Fronts for Main Street
- Doors (not included in Storefronts)
- Windows(not included in Storefronts)
- Balconies/Decks
- Awnings
- Chimney and Stovepipes
- Mechanical Equipment
- Materials

### **New Accessory Structures**

#### **Treatment of Historic Building Materials**

- Wood
- Masonry
- Architectural Metals
- Exterior Paint & Color

#### **Relocation, Panelization, and Reconstruction of Historic Buildings**

#### **Sustainability in Historic Buildings**

#### **Seismic Upgrades in Historic Buildings**

#### **ADA Compliance**

#### **Exterior Lighting**

#### **Signs**

#### **Mailboxes & Other Visual Elements in the Landscape**

10. The applicant will remove a portion of the north wall of the non-historic garage, measuring approximately 19 feet by 29 feet, as well as a portion of the roof above this area. The partial demolition is required for the renovation of the building.

Conclusions of Law – 1445 Woodside Avenue

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

Conditions of Approval – 1445 Woodside Avenue

1. Final building plans and construction details shall reflect substantial compliance with the HDDR proposal stamped in on November 23, 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. Design Guideline Revisions – Staff recommends that the Historic Preservation Board take public comment on the proposed changes to the Design Guidelines for Park City’s Historic Districts and Historically Significant Buildings; provide specific amendments to be made to the document if necessary; and make a recommendation to City Council (Council review will be after the entire Guidelines are reviewed by the HPB) (Application GI-13-00222)

Planner Hannah Turpen reported that this was one of many Staff reports for Design Guideline revisions that the Historic Preservation Board would see this year. She reviewed Exhibit A to explain what they would be looking at this evening and the process for future meetings. The left side of the exhibit showed how the Guidelines are currently laid out and the right side showed the proposed revisions. Planner Turpen noted that the Guidelines have not been revised since their adoption in 2009.

Planner Turpen commented on Site Design and Universal Guidelines. She pointed out that the existing Site Design does not have as many sections as the Proposed Site Design. The Staff was proposing to add more sections to address additional items in the current Design Guidelines.

Planner Turpen commented on National versus Local Review. She stated that the Design Guidelines are based on the Secretary of the Interior Standards for Preservation, Rehabilitation, Restoration and Reconstruction. She stated that the City does not always enforce the Secretary of Interior Standards. They rely solely on the Design Guidelines which are based on the National Standards; but the City enforces its local document.

Planner Turpen started the discussion with Universal Guidelines. She noted that the Staff was proposing to change Universal Guideline #4 to include, "It may be appropriate to reproduce missing historic elements that are consistent with properties of similar design, age and detailing in some cases". They also added clarification to Universal Guideline #9 with language, "The new work should be differentiated from the historic structure or construction and should be compatible with the historic structure or construction in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the property and its environment".

Board Member Melville noted that the Board does not always see the problems the Staff has when applying the Guidelines. She asked for an example of why it was being proposed and how it would help the Staff.

Planner Grahn clarified that they were looking at guidelines that apply only to Historic residential structures. Ms. Melville stated that her question was more specific to the changes for Universal Guidelines 4 and 9. Director Erickson noted that the Board saw an example this evening where a non-historic porch would be removed and replaced with a porch that may be more historically in keeping with the home. That type of situation was addressed by Universal Guideline #4.

Planner Turpen noted that the language underlined in red in the Staff report was new language that the Staff was proposing to add. The Staff had added language in areas that needed more clarification so when the Guidelines are applied it is clear and not open to interpretation by a developer. Director Erickson used the boarding house renovation on Park Avenue that was discussed at the last meeting as an example of how the added language would bring the home more into compatibility, which was the purpose of this particular section. The language talks more about rhythm and scale and certain elements.

Planner Turpen assumed that the Board had read the Staff report and were aware of the proposed language. Therefore she did not intend to read all of the changes. She had only read #4 and #9 because the Universal Guidelines are broad and she wanted to hone in on exactly what was being changed in this section. Board Member Melville encouraged the Staff to give examples to help them understand the reason for the changes and the benefit.

Planner Grahn spoke about Site Design and Building Setbacks.

A.1 Building Setbacks and Orientation - Planner Grahn stated that the Staff removed "A.1.3 Maintain the original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant", because they were addressing it in a different section.

A.2 Topography and Grading – Planner Grahn noted that nothing changed other than adding “or vice-versa” in A2.2. She explained that if the site is relatively paved they would not want to change the built or paved area too drastically because it would change the character of the site.

Ms. Melville noted that word “Grading” had also been added. She asked if the Guideline, “Maintain the original grading of the site” had been applied in the past. Planner Grahn stated that it also says, “...when and where feasible. She stated that the LMC requirement is to retain the finished grade after the project within four feet of existing grade. In Old Town they always look at where the grade will be after a new basement foundation goes in because they try to avoid having too much visible concrete. Director Erickson explained that this particular clause refers to the historic home that was raised and put on a very modern concrete foundation. The HPB had concerns about how the grading and the metal retaining wall that was in place. The intent of the proposed change is to clarify how they review that particular action. Director Erickson referred to the HPB picture of the house with the oversized steps and noted that this guideline would try to avoid that from occurring again.

Planner Grahn reiterated that the language written in black was currently in the existing Guidelines. Only the proposed changes were shown in red. Planner Turpen clarified that all the language in black was being applied currently, and the purpose of the changes in red was to strengthen that language and make it easier to enforce the guideline.

A.3 Landscaping and Vegetation - Planner Grahn stated that site grading was removed because it was addressed under Topography and Grading. She pointed out that in addition to protecting mature vegetation with this guideline, they were also trying to protect the historic houses from mature vegetation as stated in Guideline A.3.1. Planner Grahn stated that either the Secretary of the Interior or the National Parks Service came up with Design Guidelines for energy efficiency. That was where the storm water management features and storm water management systems, etc. came from in A.3.7. They want to make sure that people develop landscape plans that last and that landscaping is not being redone every year. That was addressed in the language added to A.3.3.

Board Member Holmgren understood from the photos she has seen and people she spoke with that Park City used to have a lot of fruit trees and lilacs. She was vocally opposed when the plum trees were removed behind a restaurant. Ms. Holmgren suggested that in the Design Review process the Staff could encourage applicants to plant that type of landscaping because it does grow. Planner Turpen stated that they could add a sidebar and include examples of vegetation that was historically found in the City. She thought it would be interesting for the Staff to do that research.

Board Member Melville liked the added language in A.3.2 to protect established vegetation and replace removed vegetation with similar vegetation. She noted that too often mature trees are removed during construction and replaced with smaller stick-like trees. Planner Grahn stated that the Staff has had a policy to address those situations. When mature trees are taken down the Staff requests that it be replaced with a 2:1 ratio of something similar. In addition, they look at the diameter of the tree at chest height to make sure that if a 10" diameter is replaced with a 1" diameter, they need to replace it with ten trees. The Staff was looking at revising that requirement, but they were losing a lot of mature vegetation and this Guideline would help reduce the amount. Ms. Melville thought it was better to require bigger trees as opposed to a lot of smaller trees.

Board Member Holmgren suggested that the Staff research which trees do well in Park City. For example, aspen trees last about four years and eventually need to be removed. Box Elder is another garbage tree that people like to plant.

Board Member Stephens remarked that the Board was looking at the vegetation on its own merits, but the Planning Department looks at it in relationship to parking, construction, etc. He thought it would be interesting to get an idea from the Planning Department on how they weight what is more important. Mr. Stephens stated that Mr. Erickson had commented on a historic house that was lifted and the grade was changed, but at the same time a garage was going in to facilitate off-street parking. He recognized that it was a difficult job but he was unsure how they judge it. Director Erickson replied that it was an interesting balancing act. The first priority is not to negatively affect the historic home. The second priority is not to negatively affect the historic district, which is where vegetation comes into play. He stated that the Planning Department would rather restrict grading and protect a tree than to accommodate parking. However, fir trees go decadent after 60 years and Aspen trees are inappropriate. He believed the strongest trees in the District are fruit trees and lilac bushes. Director Erickson believed it was appropriate to add plant materials as a sidebar. He clarified that he is personally opposed to removing a dead tree if it is a wildlife tree with bird species living in it.

Board Member Holmgren asked if there was an ordinance that prohibits using rain barrels. Director Erickson answered yes. Ms. Melville thought the ordinance had been changed to allow it. Director Erickson explained that the State Division of Water Rights regulates how much water can be collected without a permit. Water can be collected in a rain barrel and registered, but the rest has to run down stream so farmers can water the grass. He was unaware of any restrictions in the Historic District Guidelines that prohibit water barrels.

Planner Grahn asked if the Board wanted to add a guideline regarding rain barrels. Board Member Holmgren stated that she would like the ability to use them. Director Erickson reiterated that she already has that ability because the

City does not regulate rain barrels. He suggested that if a rain barrel is proposed as part of a reconstruction or restoration the Staff could ask that the location be included on the site plan. If an owner wanted to place a rain barrel on their existing home it should not be an issue for the Planning Department to regulate unless it encroaches into the setback or over a property line.

Assistant City Attorney McLean recommended that the Staff include a comment in the redlines to indicate items that were redlined because they were moved to another section. Another option would be to underline it in a different color. She believed it would help the Board know that it was not deleted and where they could find it.

Planner Turpen stated that she and Planner Grahn were finding numbering errors. She asked the Board to let them know if they find issues with the numbering. Planner Grahn pointed out that the sections are numbered primarily to keep the Staff reports organized. She assumed the final version of the Design Guidelines would have to be renumbered based on comments and feedback from the HPB.

A.4 Stone Retaining Walls - Planner Turpen recalled discussing this item in the Fall and early Winter in terms of what defines the streetscape. They found that there are a lot of historic retaining walls but it is difficult to regulate what new walls are supposed to look like and how they deal with the ones they already have. She pointed out that most of this section was in red because the current guidelines have very little about retaining walls.

Planner Turpen stated that A.2.1 talks about maintaining a line of stone retaining walls along the street; and that goes back to the streetscape. She recalled from the Fall discussion that Board Member Stephens talked about how the walls stepped with the topography of the street and they needed to be able to respect that. She stated that A.2.2 was moved to another section. Director Erickson referred to the April Inn retaining wall as an example and noted that the new guideline would regulate that wall much more effectively. Ms. Melville liked that that language specifically calls for reusing the existing stone where possible. She thought it would be even better if they could make the language stronger than "where possible". Director Erickson suggested, "to the greatest extent practicable".

Board Member Hodgkins asked why they named this section stone retaining walls and not just retaining walls. Planner Grahn stated that they could change it to masonry retaining walls because it also includes brick and concrete. Planner Turpen suggested changing it to Retaining Walls to encompass all walls.

Planner Turpen noted that the newly proposed A.2.2 states that "Walls should be repaired with materials that closely approximate the original". She stated that

A.2.3 addresses reducing the number of failing walls by encouraging applicants to improve the drainage behind existing walls. A.2.4. - New walls shall be consistent with historic features and design, materials and scale. A.2.5 - Walls of brick should be reconstructed based on physical or pictorial evidence. A.2.6 – Maintain stone in its Natural Finish. It is not appropriate to paint, stain or plaster over stone.

Board Member Melville asked if this would prevent the use of plate steel. Planner Grahn believed it was covered under A.2.4 in terms of materials. Board Member Hewett asked if they could list the type of stone that would be preferred if a wall was built from scratch. Planner Grahn stated that recommended materials could be listed as a sidebar; however, she cautioned against being overly prescriptive. Director Erickson thought they could be consistent with what they know on local knowledge, and that the stone needs to retain a traditional shape and that the materials need to be sourced locally. He would work on geographically defining locally.

Chair White stated that recently they have been saying that walls should be of stone in a size that a person could carry, and they should be hand stacked or look hand stacked to be consistent with how the walls were originally built. The Board talked about stone size, shape and color. Planner Turpen thought they could include a photos of an authentic Park City wall, which would make it easier to enforce. She stated that the Staff has been successful in Design Review Team meetings making it clear that the stone must be something a miner could carry and that it is rectangular or square. Ms. Melville was not opposed to that criteria as long as it resulted in something historic looking and not a wall with modern stone.

A.3 – Fences - Planner Turpen noted that in A.3.1 language was added to state, “Historic fences should be preserved and maintained”. She noted that language in A.3.2 describes what appropriate wood fences should look like. Wood fences should have flat, dog-eared or pointed tops similar to what was typically used. The language gives specific dimensions. Planner Grahn noted that the information was pulled from the previous Park City Design Guidelines.

Board Member Holmgren asked about metal fences. Planner Grahn believed they would be open to it as long as it was compatible with the design of the building. However, the LMC does not allow chain link fences other than for LOD fencing. Planner Turpen stated that A.3.3 says, “New wood and metal fences located in the front yard should be traditional designs and patterns”.

Board Member Stephens asked if the wood picket fences were only for reconstruction. He preferred to move the measurements into a sidebar to keep it from becoming too specific. Mr. Stephen thought a 3-1/2 inch wide board would have been new dimensional lumber. In the 1900s it would have been a 4-inch

board. He believed a sidebar would force the applicant to show what was there or what might be compatible with the house, but still allow some flexibility.

Planner Turpen stated that A.3.5 talks about how the wood fence should be painted to be complimentary to the adjacent house. A.3.6 encourages the use of drought tolerant shrubs in place of a fence or wall. A.3.7 states, "Arbors emphasizing a fence gate or entry shall be subordinate to the associated historic building or structure and shall complement the design of the historic structure and fence in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic property and its environment". She pointed out that the current guidelines do not address arbors and the Staff sometimes gets pushback on arbor proposals because nothing is in writing.

A.4. – Paths, Steps, Handrails, & Railings (Not associated with porches). Planner Grahn noted that these were ones not associated with porches. The first guideline was moved from a different section. A.4.3 relates to compatibility and the issues they identified in various photos at the last meeting. Language in A.4.4 indicates that Historic handrails should be maintained and preserved if they exist. In A.4.5 they need to make sure that they complement the historic structure and the site in general.

Board Member Hewett asked for an example of a historic handrail. Planner Grahn replied that all handrails have to meet the Building Department Code for safety. Historic handrails could just be a wood railing on steps. It could also be similar to metal plumbing pipes that are simple in design. Ms. Hewett stated that she was thinking of the 1970s houses where some things are not attractive. She was concerned about suggesting round circle railings.

#### A.5. – Gazebos, Pergolas, and Other Shade Structures.

Planner Grahn reiterated that the Staff was seeing more demand for arbors and these types of structures. The language promotes that they be subordinate to the associated historic buildings or structure, complement the design, and should be limited to rear or side yards so they are not in the front yard or affecting the integrity of the site. They should not be attached to associated buildings or structures because they would no longer be a freestanding shade structure.

#### A.6. – Parking Areas, Detached Garages and Driveways.

Planner Turpen stated that the change to this section was primarily adding language for clarification and details. A.6.5 was added to "Consider using textured and pour paving materials other than smooth concrete for driveways in the front yard. Use permeable paving where appropriate on a historic site to manage storm water. Permeable paving may not be appropriate for all driveways and parking areas. A.6.6 was added to say, "Avoid paving up to the building

foundation to reduce heat island effect, building temperature, damage to the foundation, and storm-water runoff”.

Board Member Beatlebrox stated that the textured and poured paving materials language reminded her of how the City beautified the area going to the Transit Center. She asked if they were talking about that type of material or something different. Planner Grahn thought they would be open to people using pavers. Traditionally there were wood sidewalks and gravel or dirt driveways so there was some room for flexibility. However, they would not want the driveway to detract from the historic site or become the focal point. Textured materials would be allowed and pavers would be considered a textured material. She pointed out that the language specifically states poured concrete because a smooth concrete finish is too modern.

Board Member Melville asked how the Guideline would keep people from paving over the entire front of the house. Planner Grahn replied that it goes back to the design guideline regarding the site plan and how they should not have a substantial amount of paved or built area. Planner Grahn stated that the LMC and the current Design Guidelines do not allow more than 12’ of width on the driveway. They could add it to this section for clarification.

Board Member Melville asked how the Staff addresses the fact that these are only guidelines and not requirements when applicants raise that issue. Director Erickson stated that if the Staff makes a determination based on applying the design guidelines, the applicant would have the right to appeal that decision to the Board of Adjustment. Planner Grahn believed the LMC also states that if there is a discrepancy between the guidelines and the LMC the stricter of the two applies.

Director Erickson followed up on the question regarding the 12’ driveway width and noted that it was addressed in D.3 of the existing Guidelines.

Board Member Beatlebrox complimented the Staff on thoroughness and a job well done. It was evident that they had carefully listened to the comments made by the Board and they had drafted language that made the guidelines very clear.

Planner Grahn explained the breakdown of Exhibit A and the color coded categories. Director Erickson stated that in effect they were remapping the Guidelines between the existing and the proposed. It was more of a tracking mechanism for the Staff.

Planner Turpen commented on process. She noted that the Design Guidelines would not go to the City Council for adoption until the HPB completes all of the revisions.

Chair White opened the public hearing.

Jim Tedford stated that he was representing a group called Preserve Historic Main Street. They have been testifying the past few years concerning the Kimball Corner. As he listened to the proposed changes a couple of things came to mind. He thought separating residential and commercial was an excellent idea because some things do not apply to both. Regarding the proposed changes, Mr. Tedford noted that they had used the words “compatible” and “subordinate”, which are important words in terms of what their concerns for Kimball Corner. He pointed out that the definitions in both the current Design Guidelines and the General Plan were not the best. Mr. Tedford stated that compatible and subordinate can be interpreted in many ways without a very clear definition.

Cindy Matsumoto, a Park City resident commented on language under Fences, “Drought tolerant shrubs should be considered in place of a fence or a wall.” She felt that would encourage more xeriscape which would not fit into the Old Town look. Ms. Matsumoto favored Board Member Holmgren’s idea of using lilac or rose bushes or other vegetation that was historically used between homes. Ms. Matsumoto asked the Staff to explain why they were waiting until all the revisions were completed before bringing them forward. Since the Guidelines were being revised section by section, she questioned why the City Council could not vote on them section by section. She thought it was better to have people follow the new guidelines this year when they start doing their fencing and landscaping in March rather than waiting another year to implement them.

Planner Turpen stated that the Design Guidelines are set up different than the LMC. It is one document and each section is not its own chapter. Planner Grahn explained that the goal was to keep the document together rather than section by section to avoid confusion in trying to update the website on a monthly basis. The Staff gives the Council quarterly updates and they will include which sections are being revised in each update.

Assistant City Attorney suggested that since the Guidelines were divided between existing historic houses and new construction, there may be some break points to address Ms. Matsumoto’s concerns. Planner Turpen thought they could possibly structure the new document in a way that would allow more frequent updates. Planner Grahn agreed that it would be beneficial to everyone if the Guidelines could be changed as often as the LMC.

Ruth Meintsma, a resident at 305 Woodside, had an issue with a small change on the Universal Guidelines. She pointed to the language under Landscaping, “Use to advantage the existing storm water management features such as gutters.” She was told by Sandra Morrison that there were no gutters in Old Town. Ms. Meintsma understood that gutters have become essential to help with barrels and sustainability, but since gutters did not historically exist she thought

the language as written was confusing. Ms. Meintsma noted that the language in A.5.7 “providing landscape separations” was also shown in A.6.2. She referred to the language regarding retaining walls, “Maintain the line of stone retaining walls.” She recalled that the Planning Commission calls that the setback.

Planner Grahn explained that the language in the guideline was talking about height and not the setback from the street. She offered to revise the language for better clarification.

Ms. Meintsma referred to language in A.2.3, “To reduce failure of walls, improve the drainage...” She watches a lot of structure go up and she watches the drainage that is used in new construction or new construction under historic structures. Often the drainage is nothing more than gravel backfill. She stated that gravel backfill is unsightly and nothing grows in it so it becomes dead space. She had researched different drainage systems and there are different levels of gravel and different environmental fabrics. Topsoil can be put over the top of gravel so things can grow. Ms. Meintsma suggested the possibility of coming up with a fundamental system of drainage behind a wall.

Director Erickson was not in favor of coming up with a system, but they could recommend that the final landscaping needs to have sufficient top soil and a means of retaining the top soil. It would then be up to the engineer to work out the details. He thought Ms. Meintsma had made a good point.

Ms. Meintsma referred to A.2.4 and the different types of retaining walls. She asked if simple scored concrete was the same as wood form. Planner Grahn thought it was. Ms. Meintsma clarified that if it was scored concrete it would include wood form. Planner Grahn offered to change it to simple board form concrete for clarity.

Ms. Meintsma was confused with the language, “Wood fences should be painted using colors complimentary to the adjacent house”. Planner Grahn stated that the intent is to make sure it is obvious that the fence belongs to the house. She was not opposed to eliminating the guideline if there were concerns about regulating color.

Board Member Holmgren noted that paint and color were not mentioned in the proposed guidelines and she suggested that they could just let it go. Board Member Stephens interpreted the language to mean that the fence should be painted as opposed to having an unfinished cedar fence. Planner Grahn replied that he was correct. The intent is for the wood to be painted. Planner Turpen thought they should just say that the fence should be painted. Ms. Beatlebrox agreed. She read the guideline from the standpoint of an artist and her interpretation of complimentary colors is probably different.

Planner Grahn suggested that they remove the guideline from this section. The Guidelines will have a new section regarding the treatment of historic building materials, and they could address the need to paint wood in that section.

Ms. Meintsma referred to language in A.4.3 under Paths and Steps stating that the steps should complement historic structures in materials, size and scale. She asked if it would be easier to identify a maximum width.

Planner Grahn stated that it would depend on the site. She preferred to keep the language more subjective.

Ms. Meintsma referred A.5.2, Installation of Gazebos, and the language stating that they shall be limited to rear side yards and have limited visibility when viewed from the primary right-of-way. She suggested revising the language to say, "limited visibility when viewed from public right-of-way" to address the situation of a corner lot. Ms. Meintsma suggested that they add visual examples under landscape treatment for driveways and walkways. Director Erickson clarified that it was more of a greenspace. He explained that many newer homes have a grassy area between the driveway and the sidewalk to maintain the 12' width.

Ms. Meintsma commented on off-street parking in the rear yard. Board Member Holmgren thought the language should be revised to make "If locating the parking area in the rear is physically not possible..." the first sentence. The next sentence could be that the off-street parking should be located within the rear yard.

Ms. Meintsma referred to #7 of the General Guidelines, the second sentence, "Owners are discouraged from introducing architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design when no evidence of such elements or details exist." Her interpretation is that if a house never had a front porch that architectural element could not be added.

Planner Grahn explained that the intent of the sentence is not to add features that never existed. The last sentence talks about reproducing missing historic elements and it can be based on physical or photographic evidence. For example, they might know a railing existed but they do not always have the best physical evidence. In some cases they can look to a neighboring house and reproduce an element based on their dimensions.

Ms. Meintsma understood that clarification but she still questioned whether an element could be added if there was evidence that it never existed. She referred to the first item the HPB reviewed this evening. Planner Grahn replied that it was also a reconstruction and the porch that exists was added because whoever approved it at the time thought it contributed to the historical look and feel of the

house. In this case the added porch was not in keeping with the era of the house; whereas a full-width porch was typical on hall-parlor homes. Planner Grahn pointed out that this was a unique situation because the home was reconstructed after a fire and given the neighborhood. Ms. Meintsma was concerned that they were opening a door for many things to occur if they justify it based on what exists in the neighborhood. Planner Grahn explained that if an element is being reconstructed based on photographic or physical evidence it should be replicated. However, if a new element is added, it must be compatible with the house.

Chair White closed the public hearing.

Board Member Melville referred to Mr. Tedford's comment regarding the definitions of "compatible" and "subordinate". She suggested that the HPB should look at the current definitions to see whether or not they are adequate. Planner Grahn offered to schedule that review for the next meeting. Board Member Beatlebrox thought they should also look at the definition of "complementary".

Assistant City Attorney McLean stated that the HPB should make a recommendation to the City Council on whether or not to consider the amendments as outlined. Board Member Beatlebrox was uncomfortable making a recommendation until the suggested changes were incorporated and the guidelines are re-drafted. She wanted to look at the next draft before forwarding a recommendation. Chair White concurred.

MOTION: Board Member Beatlebrox moved to CONTINUE the draft that was discussed this evening to February 3, 2016. Board Member Holmgren seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Board Member Beatlebrox asked if there was a way to have links to each section rather than relying on a full PDF document. Planner Grahn thought it was a good suggestion and they would look into it. Planner Turpen pointed out that if items are eliminated from some sections, the links would not be current. Assistant City Attorney McLean thought the Staff could meet internally to come up with a strategy to address this issue.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 p.m.

Approved by \_\_\_\_\_

# Design Guidelines for Historic Sites in Park City

---

## Universal Guidelines

1. A site should be used as it was historically or be given a new use that requires minimal change to the distinctive materials and features.
2. Changes to a site or building that have acquired historic significance in their own right should be retained and preserved.
3. The historic exterior features of a building should be retained and preserved.
4. Distinctive materials, components, finishes, and examples of craftsmanship should be retained and preserved. Owners are encouraged to reproduce missing historic elements that were original to the building, but have been removed. Physical or photographic evidence should be used to substantiate the reproduction of missing features. In some cases, where there is insufficient evidence to allow for an accurate reconstruction of the lost historic elements, it may be appropriate to reproduce missing historic elements that are consistent with properties of similar design, age, and detailing.
5. Deteriorated or damaged historic features and elements should be repaired rather than replaced. Where the severity of deterioration or existence of structural or material defects requires replacement, the feature or element should match the original in design, dimension, texture, material, and finish. The applicant must demonstrate the severity of deterioration or existence of defects by showing that the historic materials are no longer safe and/or serviceable and cannot be repaired to a safe and/or serviceable condition.
6. Features that do not contribute to the significance of the site or building and exist prior to the adoption of these guidelines, such as incompatible windows, aluminum soffits, or iron porch supports or railings, may be maintained; however, if it is proposed they be changed, those features must be brought into compliance with these guidelines.
7. Each site should be recognized as a physical record of its time, place and use. Owners are discouraged from introducing architectural elements or details that visually modify or alter the original building design when no evidence of such elements or details exists.
8. Chemical or physical treatments, if appropriate, should be undertaken using recognized preservation methods. Treatments that cause damage to historic materials should not be used. Treatments that sustain and protect, but do not alter appearance, are encouraged.
9. New construction—such as new additions, exterior alterations, repairs, upgrades, etc. — or related new construction should not destroy historic materials, features, and spatial relationships that characterize the historic site or building historic structure. New construction should differentiate from the historic structure and, at the same time, be compatible with the historic structure in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic structure, the historic site, and its environment.
10. New additions and related new construction should be undertaken in such a manner that, if removed in the future, the essential form and integrity of the historic property and its environment could be restored.

## Specific Guidelines

### SITE DESIGN

#### *BUILDING SETBACKS & ORIENTATION*

~~A.1.1~~ Maintain the existing front and side yard setbacks of ~~H~~historic ~~S~~sites.

~~A.1.2~~ Preserve the original location of the main entry of the historic structure, if extant.

~~A.1.3~~ Maintain the original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant.

#### *TOPOGRAPHY AND GRADING*

~~A.5.8~~ Maintain the natural topography and original grading of the site when and where feasible.

~~A.5.3~~ The historic character of the site should not be significantly altered by substantially changing the proportion of built and/or paved area to open space, and vice versa.

#### *LANDSCAPING & SITE GRADING VEGETATION*

~~A.5.1~~ Respect and maintain existing landscape features that contribute to the historic character of the site- and existing landscape features that provide sustainability benefits.

Maintain established on-site native plantings. During construction, protect established vegetation to avoid damage. Replace damaged, aged, or diseased trees as necessary. Vegetation that may encroach upon or damage the historic structure may be removed, but should be replaced with similar vegetation away from the historic structure.

~~A.5.2~~ Incorporate landscape treatments for driveways, walkways, paths, building and accessory structures in a comprehensive, complimentary and integrated design.

~~A.5.3~~ The historic character of the site should not be significantly altered by substantially changing the proportion of built or paved area to open space.

~~A.5.6~~ Provide a detailed landscape plan that respects, particularly for the front yard, areas viewable from the public right-of-way, that respects the manner and materials historically used traditionally in the historic districts. When planning for the long-term sustainability of a landscape system, consider all landscape relationships on the site, the relationship between the site and its structure(s), as well as the relationship between plants and other plants on a site.

~~A.5.4~~ Landscape plans should balance water efficient irrigation methods and drought tolerant and native plant materials with existing plant materials and site features that contribute to the historic significance of the site.

Use to advantage stormwater management features, such as gutters and downspouts as well as site topography and vegetation, that contribute to the sustainability of the historic site.

Where watering systems are necessary, use systems that minimize water loss, such as drip irrigation. Consider the use of xeriscaping or permaculture strategies for landscape design to maximize water efficiency; these systems should be designed to maintain the historic character of areas viewable from the public right-of-way.

~~A.5.5~~ Landscape plans should allow for snow storage from driveways.

~~A.5.7 Provide landscaped separations between parking areas, drives, service areas, and public use areas including walkways, plazas, and vehicular access points.~~

~~A.5.8 Maintain the original grading of the site when and where feasible.~~

## ***STONE RETAINING WALLS***

~~A.2.1 Maintain historic stone retaining walls in their original locations. Maintain the historic height and setback of retaining walls along the street. Retaining walls of stone, concrete, or rock-faced concrete block that are original to the historic site should be preserved and maintained in their original dimensions.~~

~~A.2.2 Maintain the original dimensions of historic retaining walls.~~

~~Removing portions of retaining walls for new driveways and pathways should be avoided to the greatest extent possible, but where it must occur, visual impacts should be minimized.~~

~~Retaining walls should be repaired with materials that closely approximate the original. Replace only those portions of historic retaining walls that have deteriorated beyond repair. When repair of a deteriorated retaining wall is not feasible, the replacement must reuse the existing stone to the greatest extent possible, and otherwise match the original in color, shape, size, material, and design.~~

~~To abate retaining wall failure, improve drainage behind retaining walls so water drains away from the walls. Repair and preserve historic stone and mortar.~~

~~New retaining walls should be consistent with historic retaining walls in design, materials, scale of materials, as well as size and mass of the wall. Simple board-formed concrete, stone, and other historic materials are recommended over concrete block, asphalt, or other modern concrete treatments.~~

~~Non-extant historic retaining walls of concrete or stone specific to the historic site may be reconstructed based on physical or pictorial evidence. Historically appropriate concrete or stone walls, if consistent with the historic character of the district, may be added to the area of a historic site viewable from the public right-of-way.~~

~~Maintain stone in its natural finish. It is not appropriate to paint, stain, or plaster over stone or concrete.~~

## ***FENCES FENCING & HANDRAILS***

~~A.3.1 Maintain historic fences and handrails. Historic fencing should be preserved and maintained.~~

~~A.3.2 Historic fences fencing and handrails may be reconstructed based on photographic evidence. The reconstruction should match the original in design, color, texture and material.~~

~~A.3.3 New fences fencing and handrails should reflect the building's structure's style and period. New wood and metal fencing located where viewable from the public right-of-way should feature traditional design and pattern. Split or horizontal rail, railroad tie, or timber fencing may be located where not viewable from the public right-of-way, but should be avoided where visible from public right-of-way. Vinyl or plastic-coated fencing is not appropriate.~~

~~New fencing should be designed to minimize its environmental impacts. New fencing should use green materials and should take into account site impacts such as shading, natural topography, and drainage.~~

~~Drought tolerant shrubs should be considered in place of fencing or walls.~~

Arbors emphasizing a fence gate or entry shall be subordinate to the associated historic structure and shall complement the design of the historic structure and fencing in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and as well as massing to protect the integrity of the historic site.

### **PATHS, STEPS, HANDRAILS, & RAILINGS (NOT ASSOCIATED WITH PORCHES)**

A.1.3 Maintain The original path or steps leading to the main entry, if extant, should be preserved and maintained.

A.4.1 Maintain Historic hillside steps that ~~may be~~ are an integral part of the landscape. should be preserved and maintained.

New hillside steps should be visually subordinate to the associated historic structure in materials, size, scale and proportion, as well as massing and shall complement the historic structure in materials, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic site. For longer-run stairs, consider changes in material to break up the mass of the stairs.

Historic handrails should be preserved and maintained. Historic handrails may be reconstructed based on photographic evidence; the reconstruction should match the original in size, design, color, texture, and material.

New handrails and railings shall complement the historic structure in materials, size, scale and proportions, massing and design to protect the integrity of the historic structure and site.

### **GAZEBOS, PERGOLAS, AND OTHER SHADE STRUCTURES**

Gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures should be visually subordinate to the associated historic structure(s) and should complement the design of the historic structure(s) in materials, features, size, scale and proportion, and massing to protect the integrity of the historic structure and site.

The installation of gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall be limited to rear or side yards and have limited visibility when viewed from the public right-of-way.

Gazebos, pergolas, and other shade structures shall not be attached to the associated historic structure(s), or damage historic features of associated or neighboring historic structure(s).

### **PARKING AREAS, ~~DETACHED GARAGES,~~ & DRIVEWAYS**

#### **C.1 Off-street parking**

A.5.2 Minimize the visual impacts of on-site parking by ~~incorporate~~ ing landscape treatments for driveways, walkways, paths, ~~building and accessory~~ and structures in a comprehensive, complimentary and integrated design.

A.5.7 Provide landscaped separations between parking areas, drives, service areas, and public use areas including walkways, plazas, and vehicular access points.

~~C.1.3~~ C.1.3 When locating new off-street parking areas, the existing topography of the ~~building~~ building site and ~~significant~~ integral site features should be minimally impacted.

C.1.1 Off-street parking areas should be located within the rear yard and beyond the rear wall plane of the primary structure where feasible. ~~C.1.2~~ C.1.2 If locating a parking area in the rear yard is not physically

possible, the off-street parking area and associated vehicles should be visually buffered from adjacent properties and the primary public right-of-way. Consider providing a driveway along the side yard of the property where feasible.

## C.2 Driveways

C.2.1 When locating driveways, the existing topography of the building site and significant site features should be minimally impacted.

C.2.2 Ten foot (10') wide driveways are encouraged; however, new driveways should not exceed twelve (12) feet in width.

C.2.3 Shared driveways should be used when feasible.

Consider using textured and pour paving materials other than smooth concrete for driveways viewable from the public right-of-way. Permeable paving should be used on a historic site, where appropriate, to manage storm water. Permeable paving may not be appropriate for all driveways and parking areas.

Avoid paving up to the building foundation to reduce heat island effect, building temperature, damage to the foundation, and storm-water runoff problems.

Snow storage from driveways should be provided on site.