



HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
AUGUST 6, 2007
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING
NOON

REGULAR MEETING - NOON

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

STAFF/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JULY 16, 2007

CONSENT AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARINGS/DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

PAGE #

13 Training and role discussion regarding Historic Inventory Survey & Guidelines

ADJOURN

Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals needing special accommodations during the meeting should notify the Park City Planning Department, 615-5060, prior to the meeting.

Published: August 4, 2007

Posted: August 3, 2007

MINUTES OF JULY 16, 2007

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JULY 16, 2007

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ken Martz, David White, Todd Ford, Gary Kimball, and City Council Liaison, Marianne Cone

EX OFFICIO: Patrick Putt, Brooks Robinson, Sharon Mayes-Atkinson, Polly Samuels McLean, Patricia Abdullah

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

Chair Martz called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m. and noted that all Board Members were present except for Mark Huber and Puggy Holmgren who were excused.

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

There was no comment.

STAFF/BOARD MEMBERS COMMUNICATION

Polly Samuels McLean, Assistant City Attorney, requested that the Board Members contact Patricia Abdullah several days in advance if they cannot attend a meeting or will be late. It is important to have enough notice prior to the meeting to know whether there will be a quorum.

City Council Liaison, Marianne Cone, asked Ms. Abdullah if the Board position has been advertised. Ms. Abdullah answered yes and noted that the position closes the end of July. To date they have received two applications.

Assistant Attorney McLean provided an update on the Museum review. She understood the City Council had continued the matter due to technical issues. The Municipal Building Authority ordinance goes to the City Council and there will be a transfer of the deed. Ms. McLean believed the concept had been approved. Ms. McLean noted that there are two parts; one is the lease and the other is the regulatory portion, which is going through the historic design review. Planner Kirsten Whetstone had presented to the City Council the input that was provided by the Historic Preservation Board.

Planning Director, Patrick Putt updated the Board on a number of items. Last week they executed a new employment agreement with Dina Blaes to work on the guidelines. He and Ms. Blaes will attend the first HPB meeting in August to provide an overview of the time frame of the process itself and the HPB's involvements. Director Putt stated that noticing for the historic building inventory to the affected property owners will be sent out this week. This is

significant because once that noticing period has been completed, they will have a better idea of the number of appeals they can expect. He will report back to the HPB once they have that information so they can begin to discuss how those appeals will be processed. Council Liaison Cone asked if the entire historic district would be noticed or just the buildings included in the inventory. Director Putt was unsure and offered to find out.

Director Putt reported on a conversation he had with Sandra Morrison of the Historical Society. He noted that the Historical Society would also be notified to make sure they are aware of this process. He pointed out that the inventory might not include houses that the Historical Society or others in the community feel should be included. The point is to make sure they have allowed the necessary procedural remedies for people to comment on the list. Once that has been completed, they will ask the HPB to forward that list to the City Council for adoption.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JUNE 4, 2007 and JUNE 18, 2007.

Board Member Kimball noted that Nancie Putnam was listed as being in attendance on June 4th and June 18th and he believed she had already left prior to those meetings.

MOTION: Board Member Kimball moved to APPROVE the minutes of June 4, 2007. Board Member White seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Board Member White moved to APPROVE the minutes of June 18, 2007. Board Member Kimball seconded the motion.

REGULAR AGENDA PUBLIC HEARING/DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

1064 Park Avenue – Determination of Significance

Planner Sharon Mayes-Atkinson reviewed the application for a determination of significance. The applicant is the Michael A. & Sonja Saltman Living Trust. The structure is the old Brand X Cattle Company at 1064 Park Avenue. The building is located in the HR-1 zone and the applicant wishes to demolish the building and subdivide the property to erect three new structures with historic styling.

Planner Mayes-Atkinson remarked that the back of the building has the feel of remodeled craftsman type architecture. The front is very contemporary with a lot of glass and completely inconsistent with the rest of the building. The structure was built in the 1930's as a boarding house. It became the Sunset hotel in the 1960's and at that time the building was remodeled with a contemporary exterior.

Board Member Kimball referred to the Park Record article from 1999 on page 37 of the Staff report. He believed that article confused this structure with Maureen Foster on 7th Street and Park Avenue. He provided a brief history of the family who originally owned the building at 1064 Park Avenue building and noted that they were not in prostitution as the article suggests. Chair Martz stated that he was looking through old photographs trying to find his house and came across a photo that Ken Webb identified as the house at 1064 Park Avenue. Mr. Webb told him that he had witnessed the raid and his story coincided with the story in the Park Record.

Planner Mayes-Atkinson stated that she had searched through all the building inventories dating back to 1982. This structure was only found in one inventory where it was shown as much smaller, older, and run down. That inventory stated that the structure was not historically significant. Planner Mayes-Atkinson reported that in reviewing the five criteria for significance, she found that the structure met Criteria 4 because it is over 50 years old. The structure does not comply with the other four criteria.

The Staff recommended that the Historic Preservation Board conduct a public hearing and determine that the structure at 1064 Park Avenue is not historically significant.

Chair Martz opened the public hearing.

Sara Saltman, Mike Saltman's daughter, felt the Staff report speaks for itself. In looking at the criteria that defines maintaining the historic nature of the house, this is very much what they want to do. They are total advocates for furthering the history of Park City and maintaining the culture of Park City. They plan to live in Park City for a long time and their goal is to improve that area by building three structures that re-create the historic nature of that corner. Ms. Saltman agreed with the Staff determination that the structure does not meet the criteria for significance, other than the age issue, and that it is not historically significant.

Jim Ring, a neighbor who lives next door to the structure on Park Avenue, stated that he has lived in Park City for three years. He has watched this property be sold and resold and he wanted to know what makes something historic or not historic. The last time the house went through the sale process, the demolition was stopped because the house was found to be historic. Now that it has been sold, the issue has been raised again and this time it was not found to be historic. Mr. Ring was interested in the end result because his house will be the most impacted in the area. If the building is torn down, he wanted to know if that would give the go ahead for the project currently proposed. He was unsure if the three homes being proposed would tie into this process.

Chair Martz explained that the hearing today is to determine historic significance or insignificance. Depending on that outcome, the Planning Department would

move forward to the next step, which is to determine what could take place on that site and to address planning issues.

Principle Planner Brooks Robinson clarified that the previous ownership had submitted an application to keep the structure and to do an extensive remodel. However, the property was sold before they reached the point of determining whether or not the structure was historically significant. He recalled subdivision issues that were never worked out. Planner Robinson reported that the Planning Departments has received a number of requests for a restaurant in that building, but the zoning was changed and the commercial has gone away. He clarified that the zoning is HRM and not HR-1 as indicated in the Staff report.

Planner Mayes-Atkinson stated that a photograph, as well as her review of the property, indicates craftsman style architecture on the back. She did not believe that craftsman architecture was historic to Park City. It is unusual architecture but she was unsure if it was relevant.

Chair Martz was interested in seeing the photographs and he was interested in having an architect see it just to have knowledge of what was there before.

Chair Martz stated that he walked around the building and he thought the original roof pitch and the back wall appear to exist. He did not see anything on the front of the building that resembled the original structure.

The Board discussed the aspects of the property and the neighboring structures.

MOTION: Board Member White moved to find the building at 1064 historically insignificant, according to the Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law contained in the Staff report.

Assistant Attorney McLean noted that Finding of Fact 1 indicates that the property is in the HR-1 zone. She recommended that Board Member White amend his motion to reflect the zone change from HR-1 to HRM as stated earlier by Planner Robinson.

Board Member White amended his motion to modify the Staff report say that the building is in the HRM zone and not the HR-1 as indicated in the text and in Finding of Fact 1. Board Member Kimball seconded the motion.

VOTE: The motion passed unanimously.

Chair Martz pointed out that this area was not strictly residential and there were non-residential uses and structures. This was a large structure and he felt it would be nice to replace it with another large structure. He recommended that the applicants look at the picture shown by the Planning Staff and possibly consider something that would add interest to the streetscape.

Findings of Fact – 1064 Park Avenue

1. The structure located at 1064 Park Avenue is in the Historic Residential (HR-1) zone.
2. The property is not included in the draft 2006 survey of historic homes, and is not included in the draft 2006 survey of historic homes, and is not found to be significant in any of the historic surveys dating back to 1983.
3. The buildings contiguous to the featured property are smaller historic residential homes.
4. The structure is not distinctive in, character, method of construction, or period of construction from other structures in the Historic District.
5. The 1064 Empire Avenue structure is not contributory to the historic district even though over fifty (50) years old, due to the contemporary renovations and changes from historical building materials done throughout the years.
6. The building does not form a strong physical relationship with other historic buildings in Park City, and therefore does not contribute to the over all historic district.
7. No evidence that has been submitted or found which indicates that the structure on the property is tied to a significant historic event or person from Park City's past.
8. All findings from the Analysis section are incorporated herein.

Conclusions of Law – 1064 Park Avenue

1. The structure located at 1064 Park Avenue does not demonstrate any significance in local architecture.
2. The structure does not exhibit any features that exhibit any historical value.
3. The structure does not substantially comply with the standards of review found in LMC Section 15-11-12(A) and therefore is historically insignificant pursuant to LMC Section 15-11-12.

The meeting adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Approved by _____
Ken Martz, Chair
Historic Preservation Board

ACTION ITEMS

Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



Planning Department

Author: Patrick Putt
Subject: HPB Training
Date: August 6, 2007
Type of Item: Informational

Staff has scheduled August, 2007 as the date for the next Historic Preservation Board training session.

Monday's training will involve a review and discussion on the Historic Building Inventory schedule and appeal process; schedule for the Historic District Guidelines; and discussion on building panelization.

A. Updates

Inventory adoption

Historic District Design Guidelines

B. Discussion on Panelization:

1. Goals for August 6 meeting:
 - a. Define Panelization
 - b. Begin the discussion to set a policy that will be reflected in the Design Guidelines

2. Defining the term:
 - a. Review HPB Members' definitions of panelization.
Will come back to definition after additional discussion.

3. How does panelization differ from demolition? Partial demolition? How does disassembling a building in "sections" differ from disassembling it in pieces?

4. What causes panelization to be sought by an applicant?
 - a. Desire to move a structure:
 - i. Encroachment due to property boundary issues - building to be moved;
 - ii. Encroachment into required setbacks – building to be moved; LMC 15-2.2-4 Existing Historic Structures says, "Historic Structures that do not comply with Building Setbacks, Off-Street parking, and driveway location standards are valid Complying Structures.
 - b. Desire to remodel a structure:
 - i. Structural integrity of building is insufficient to accommodate proposed changes in interior space/room configuration;
 - ii. Addition (rear, side, basement) is being sought and integration is easier if historic structure can be removed from site.

5. Is the motivation for panelization relevant to granting approval for it? Why?

6. What is the goal of panelization? Why do you allow it?
 - a. Retain historic material?
 - b. Retain character-defining features of historic structure?
 - c. Ease the process of development on the site?

Future discussion will cover:

If panelization continues, how should the materials be protected while in storage?

What policy should govern reassembly?

How will panelization impact a determination of Historical Significance?

Patrick Putt

From: Ken Martz [kenmartz@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2007 5:47 PM
To: Patrick Putt
Subject: RE: August 6th HPB "Homework Assignment"

Pat I'm out of town in Calif. right now without the benefit of the survey which I neglected to bring with me. Panelization should be part of the Historic District guidelines under restoration process as a last resort to the preservation process where the building is in very poor condition. The builder or architect should conduct a very detailed survey of the building and its condition and determined that the building cannot be saved intact.

Planning and possibly the chief building inspector should be involved. The building should be very accurately measured and surveyed to determine the original footprint. Once its been determined that panelization is acceptable by the HPB then a preservation or panelization plan should be drawn up with the assistance of the planning department. This plan should include ongoing oversight as the process proceeds and a proper storage of the components once panelized. Extra support and shoring may be needed. Once the building is completed or remodeled the building should be considered for placement back on the Historic Survey list in its revitalized condition.

The entire process should act to contribute to the improvement of the historic district and documented as such. Does this help. Ken Martz HPB

>From: "Patrick Putt" <putt@parkcity.org>
>To: <silversunshine77@aol.com>, <dgwarch@xmission.com>, "Ken Martz"
><kenmartz@hotmail.com>, <gkimball1@msn.com>, <mark@markhuber.com>, <todd@
>iverstonedesign.com>, "Marianne
>Cone" <mccone@parkcity.org>
>CC: "Tom Bakaly" <tom@parkcity.org>, "Brooks Robinson"
><brooks@parkcity.org>, "Patricia Abdullah" <pabdullah@parkcity.org>, "D
>Blaes" <d84w3b7@qwest.net>
>Subject: August 6th HPB "Homework Assignment"
>Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2007 15:08:15 -0600

>
>Dear HPB Members:

>
>
>
>On Monday, August 6th, Dina Blaes and I will be present at HPB's
>meeting to give HPB an update on the Historic Building Inventory
>adoption and the Historic District Design Guidelines rewrite. In
>addition, we intend to commence a discussion on the issue of the
>disassembly or "Panelization" of historic buildings. By way of
>preparation for this discussion, Dina and I thought a good place to
>begin is with dialogue on what HPB considers "panelization" to be.
>Therefore, you each have a small homework assignment.

>
>
>
>By next Monday, July 30th, please send me your personal definition of
>"panelization." Don't worry now, you won't be graded. There is no
>right or wrong answer. We are not looking for a building
>code/planning-jargon definition. We are simply looking to develop a
>common understanding of the term so that we can create policies and/or
>guidelines to address the issue.

>
>
>
>Please take a few moments to think about how you would define
>"panelization." If you know "it" when you see "it", e-mail me what "it"
>is. Dina and I will compile your answers and we will work towards a
>common definition on August 6th.

Patrick Putt

From: GARY A KIMBALL [gkimball1@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2007 8:39 AM
To: Patrick Putt
Subject: RE: August 6th HPB "Homework Assignment"

Pat,

The definition is simple: It is the dismantling of a structure while foundation or other work is performed.

The problem is in storage of "panels" and their reassembling. I have heard that, at times, some panels have been lost or destroyed.

I do not know if it is true, but there is a perception that if a structure is panelized it will lose its status as a historical building (National and State status) not Park City's listing.

Not to cast blame or shame on anyone, but looking at the Tramway in front of the one time "Angel House", now the Kuhle mansion. I was told that all the stones in the retaining wall would be labeled and a "inprint" made of them; and they would be reassembled. I don't think any of the original stones were used in the rebuilding of the retaining wall. It looks like all the modern stone work. Boring! I know they will say the stones were beyond salvaging, etc. Do rocks wear out?

I hope a standard of "panelization" will be established.

Gary Kimball

>From: "Patrick Putt" <putt@parkcity.org>
>To: <silversunshine77@aol.com>, <dgwarch@xmission.com>, "Ken Martz"
><kenmartz@hotmail.com>, <gkimball1@msn.com>, <mark@markhuber.com>, <todd@r
>iverstonedesign.com>, "Marianne
>Cone" <mccone@parkcity.org>
>CC: "Tom Bakaly" <tom@parkcity.org>, "Brooks Robinson"
><brooks@parkcity.org>, "Patricia Abdullah" <pabdullah@parkcity.org>, "D
>Blaes" <d84w3b7@qwest.net>
>Subject: August 6th HPB "Homework Assignment"
>Date: Mon, 23 Jul 2007 15:08:15 -0600

>

>Dear HPB Members:

>

>

>

>On Monday, August 6th, Dina Blaes and I will be present at HPB's
>meeting to give HPB an update on the Historic Building Inventory
>adoption and the Historic District Design Guidelines rewrite. In
>addition, we intend to commence a discussion on the issue of the
>disassembly or "Panelization" of historic buildings. By way of
>preparation for this discussion, Dina and I thought a good place to
>begin is with dialogue on what HPB considers "panelization" to be.
>Therefore, you each have a small homework assignment.

>

>

>

>By next Monday, July 30th, please send me your personal definition of
>"panelization." Don't worry now, you won't be graded. There is no
>right or wrong answer. We are not looking for a building
>code/planning-jargon definition. We are simply looking to develop a
>common understanding of the term so that we can create policies and/or
>guidelines to address the issue.

Patrick Putt

From: Todd Ford [todd@riverstonedesign.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 25, 2007 2:11 PM
To: Patrick Putt; silversunshine77@aol.com; dgwarch@xmission.com; Ken Martz; gkimball1@msn.com; mark@markhuber.com; Marianne Cone
Cc: Tom Bakaly; Brooks Robinson; Patricia Abdullah; D Blaes
Subject: RE: August 6th HPB "Homework Assignment"

Pat,

Thanks for the email. Here is my take:

Panelize: verb: The act of physically separating and removing intact, exterior walls from each other, the roof, and the foundation for the express purpose of structurally stabilizing and reattaching said walls to historically sensitive, new construction where the following conditions are met:

1. The new construction is on the same parcel as the original structure,
2. The removal of the walls is in the best interest of the historic structure as determined by the HPB/staff, and where the rehabilitation of the walls is infeasible or impossible due to structural and/or site conditions.

Todd Ford
 RiverStone Design Group
 PO Box 4225
 Park City, UT 84060
 P: 435-615-2797
 C: 435-659-6732
 F: 435-615-7021
 www.riverstonedesign.com

From: Patrick Putt [mailto:putt@parkcity.org]
Sent: Monday, July 23, 2007 3:16 PM
To: silversunshine77@aol.com; dgwarch@xmission.com; Ken Martz; gkimball1@msn.com; mark@markhuber.com; Todd Ford; Marianne Cone
Cc: Tom Bakaly; Brooks Robinson; Patricia Abdullah; D Blaes
Subject: August 6th HPB "Homework Assignment"

Dear HPB Members:

On Monday, August 6th, Dina Blaes and I will be present at HPB's meeting to give HPB an update on the Historic Building Inventory adoption and the Historic District Design Guidelines rewrite. In addition, we intend to commence a discussion on the issue of the disassembly or "Panelization" of historic buildings. By way of preparation for this discussion, Dina and I thought a good place to begin is with dialogue on what HPB considers "panelization" to be. Therefore, you each have a small homework assignment.

By next **Monday, July 30th**, please send me your personal definition of "panelization." Don't worry now, you won't be graded. There is no right or wrong answer. We are not looking for a building code/planning-jargon definition. We are simply looking to develop a common understanding of the term so that we can create policies and/or guidelines to address the issue.

Please take a few moments to think about how you would define "panelization." If you know "it" when you see "it", e-mail me what "it" is. Dina and I will compile your answers and we will work towards a common definition on August 6th.