



HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD  
FEBRUARY 11, 2008  
MARSAC MUNICIPAL BUILDING  
10:00 AM

WORK SESSION – 10:00 AM

PAGE #

5 Historic District Guidelines Discussion

REGULAR MEETING

ROLL CALL

PUBLIC COMMUNICATIONS

STAFF/BOARD MEMBER'S COMMUNICATIONS AND DISCLOSURES

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CONSENT AGENDA

PUBLIC HEARINGS/DISCUSSION/ACTION ITEMS

- No Items

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: February 9, 2008

Posted: February 8, 2008



## **WORK SESSION**



# Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



**Author:** Dina Blaes, Consultant  
**Subject:** Historic District Guidelines  
Update  
**Date:** February 11, 2008  
**Type of Item:** Legislative

Planning Department

Thank you for taking the time to review the guidelines and send your comments to me this week. In order to keep the review and comment process on track, this and future memos will be broken down into three sections. First, a recap of issues and/or topics discussed during work sessions that require additional discussion and/or action. Second, responses to comments made on specific sections of the draft design guidelines. Finally, a timeline and “next steps” that will prepare us for future meetings.

## **Section 1: Issues/Topics from previous meetings:**

- 1) The two-tiered *Universal* and *Specific* approach to the guidelines? Does the HPB support this approach?
- 2) The application of the design guidelines to Historically Significant buildings located outside the historic districts? Does the HPB support this approach?
- 3) Changes to the Design Review Process – Does the HPB support them? Specifically, the introduction of an optional Volunteer Peer Review Meeting? The proposed change in the sequence of steps concerning Notice and Decision (LMC 15-11-11)?
- 4) The accurate reconstruction of buildings that once existed in Park City? Does the HPB support this policy in general or only in conjunction with panelization?
- 5) Design guidelines versus design standards. Does the HPB agree? Staff recommends these be binding regulations rather than advisory guidelines.
- 6) Disassembly/Reassembly - A number of issues remain unresolved and this will be the topic of discussions in the future that will include the HPB, planning staff, building department staff, Planning Commission, and City Council.
- 7) Residential Infill – The potential conflict between requesting an owner/applicant to determine a style and design in a manner that is true to its architectural elements and details vs. prohibiting and/or requiring architectural elements that may dictate the architectural elements of new residential buildings. We will be discussing this more in the future.

Staff requests HPB direction on items 1-5. Staff will return at subsequent meeting to discuss items 6-7.

## **Section 2: Comments on specific sections of the Design Guidelines (Draft, 27 January 2008)**

**Comment 1 (T. Ford): Page 17: Add landscape Improvements or somehow address the 'exterior work' if it does not involve the structure, but does alter the historic landscape features.**

Response: So noted and we can clarify; however, if the “exterior work” does not require a building permit, it is not subject to design review (LMC 15-11-11.).

**Comment 2 (T. Ford): Page 19. When assessing roof framing etc. ensure that the report is from a Licensed Architect or a Structural Engineer.**

Response: Previous page, states...from the architect or engineer, if available. I assume you are suggesting that “if available” be removed and that the information be provided only by an architect or engineer. We will need to coordinate this requirement and language with the Building Department.

**Comment 3 (T. Ford): Page 20-21. I disagree with the current and proposed process of Planning Director Appeal. Seems out of place, unnecessary, and odd.**

Response: This is current procedure in the LMC. May be considered as part of the larger policy discussions surrounding the design review process.

**Comment 4 (T. Ford): Page 21. Step 4 should read 'Once the HDDRA is submitted to the City Planning Staff and deemed complete by City Planning Staff, the Project Planner....**

Response: So noted.

**Comment 5 (T. Ford): Page 21. Step 5 should remove the reference to 'reasonable times' and just leave it that they will take written comment for 10 days.**

Response: The “reasonable times” language was included to allow the planning staff to manage the public input process with his/her existing work load. The process, as it was originally conceived, would require staff to be present while a member of the public reviewed the file, asked questions, and provided written comment. This could interfere with time sensitive projects the staff may be managing. I am inclined to defer to staff on this one.

**Comment 6 (T. Ford): Page 21. Step 6 and 6B should remove 'reasonable time' and set a deadline of 30 days. Deadlines should work both ways, not just on the applicant.**

Response: Again, this is to allow staff to appropriately manage their work load.

**Comment 7 (T. Ford): Page 24. Prohibit Chain link and vinyl fences.**

Response: Chain link is already prohibited (LMC 15-4-2) in all zones with few exceptions. Prohibition of vinyl would require a change to LMC which is why the “should be avoided” language is used in the design guidelines.

**Comment 8 (T. Ford): Page 24. Does the stair provision reference stairs on the structures or as part of the landscape? Please clarify.**

Response: So noted.

**Comment 9 (T. Ford): Page 25. On the majority of homes, how can off street parking not be visible from the Public ROW?**

Response: Valid point. We are trying to minimize the visual impact of off street parking solutions. It should be noted that we have not yet compared LMC 15-3 Off Street Parking in its entirety to the draft guidelines.

**Comment 10 (T. Ford): Page 25. 5.2 needs exceptions. 5.4 should set a max width of 12 feet.**

Response: Exceptions are provided by using the term "should". Again, we have LMC 15-3-3 General Parking Area and Driveway Standards to consider.

**Comment 11 (T. Ford): Page 27. Why are storm/screen doors prohibited? Screen doors were not used historically? Seems odd. The two foot foundation rule seems very low. We should discuss. The color chart should be formally incorporated into this document and not randomly kept by 'the City'**

Response: 1) Storm doors are not prohibited, but rather discouraged on facades visible for the public ROW. No, they were not typically used in Park City—other places, yes, but not Park City. Also, please keep in mind that based on the Universal Guidelines, if an owner can show that the building had a screen door historically, there is no reason to deny an accurate reproduction. This would fall under Universal Guideline 4-*owners are encouraged to reproduce missing historic elements that were original to the building, but have been removed...* 2) we can discuss the 2' foundation rule, but remember, it is a guideline designed to discourage lifting historic homes so high off the original grade that they appear to be floating. Obviously, a house buried below the street on a downhill lot may not be able to adhere to this guideline and, because it is a guideline, would not be required to maintain a 2' foundation above grade.

**Comment 12 (T. Ford): Page 28. Any place that says 'has been determined' it is critical to say determined by WHO.**

Response: It is assumed in this instance that it would be the owner/applicant. We will clarify.

**Comment 13 (T. Ford): Page 28 1.4. Transitional element language should be removed. This is not consistent with the ways historic buildings grow. Why cannot a new addition appear as an organic growth of the historic structure? This also goes to 2.1. Why cannot new design 'copy' or replicate historic architecture? This makes no sense to me. These provisions are how we get new additions that scar and mar the original design.**

Response: What is presented is accepted preservation practice, but this issue is worthy of discussion.

**Comment 14 (T. Ford): Page 29. 3.2. How can a new addition not extend beyond the wall planes of the historic structure? Is that not usually the whole point of an addition?**

Response: This is an issue with basement additions. If the below grade wall extends beyond the primary (usually front) or secondary (usually side) facades what you get is the historic structure looking very much like the top tier of a wedding cake. It is not a compatible approach.

**Comment 15 (T Ford): Page 33. Is the sign language here necessary for residential structures?**

Response: It is included because some of the H Commercial zones include residential-type structures that have been converted to commercial use.

**Comment 16 (T. Ford): Page 34. 2.4. The light pollution language should be more explicit such as referencing a Dark Sky Ordinance or mandating downward facing lights etc.**

Response: The language is not explicit in the guidelines because the language in the LMC provides a much greater level of specificity. The goal of the guidelines is to provide a little more of the “how” to achieve the legal requirements of the LMC and to restate important points.

**Comment 17 (T Ford): Page 36. 1. I disagree to a point that commercial buildings should be used for their original use. The Kimball arts center should still be a garage? One of the beautiful features of historic commercial buildings is their multi-use capabilities. That is how they stand the test of time and adapt through different market conditions unlike buildings we create now which can only be used for a single purpose. You don't buy a CVS drug store building and make it into a restaurant...you just tear it down and start over.**

Response: I do not disagree with the concept, neither would most preservationists. The purpose of this guideline is to reinforce the concept that not all historic buildings respond well to every adaptive reuse scenarios. Using your example of Kimball Art Center—the program for an art center calls for open plan to accommodate galleries and classrooms, large windows for natural light, etc... The traditional use of a garage—large open bays, large display windows, etc... made the adaptive reuse of the building as an art center compatible. A different use, such as, a doctor's office which needs a honeycomb of small exam rooms with privacy (hence, no large windows) would be a more difficult reuse to accommodate in the Kimball Art Center building. The guideline does not preclude an applicant from proposing a challenging reuse plan, it simply lets the applicants know up front that this may be an issue—Don't try to fit a square peg into a round hole if it can be avoided.

**Comment 18 (T. Ford): Page 37. 3.1 Rehabilitate should be added to the fence provision. 3.3. The prohibition of metal fences seems odd. There were no cast iron fences in town? 4.2 Provide examples of textured paving material that is appropriate.**

Response: Regarding 3.1 and 4.2, so noted. Regarding 3.3 this guideline does not prohibit metal fences; it simply states what was *typically* found in Park City. If you and other HPB members feel it is confusing or implies limitations, we can get rid of the reference all together.

**Comment 19 (T. Ford): Page 38. 4.4. The buffer sentence should read. "...buffer off street parking areas and associated vehicles from adjacent properties and public Right of Ways"**

Response: So noted.

**Comment 20 (T. Ford): Page 40. 5.4 Define and flesh out 'pedestrian oriented'. 5.8 Prohibit Roof signs.**

Response: Regarding 5.4, we can provide greater clarity. Regarding 5.8, we will remove this guideline because LMC 12-7-1 prohibits them already.

**Comment 21 (T. Ford): Page 41. Why are metal awnings prohibited? Were they not used?**

Response: No they were not commonly used, but as with Comment 11 an owner/applicant has some flexibility based on historic elements that have been lost.

**Comment 22 (T. Ford): Comments RE Relocation and Reorientation, 1. The entire section should contain a paragraph that reminds the reader that these techniques should only be used to rebuild the historic building in its ORIGINAL form and not as a means to use the historic elements to create an architectural Frankenstein. 2. Where ever the word 'determined' is used, please indicate who is making the determination. (HPB, staff, Structural Engineer, etc.). Further, additional submittal requirements should be laid out for these determinations. Throughout this sections and the document in general, Licensed Architects and Structural Engineers should be referenced.**

**3. The Protection of Historic Elements after their disassembly should contain some language to protect them from water, snow, mud and construction zones or other heavily trafficked areas.**

Response: Regarding 1. the Relocation/Reorientation section states “for intact buildings”. Disassembly/reassembly is addressed in a subsequent section. Regarding 2. we will indicate who is authorized to make the “determination”. Regarding 3. we will clarify the language in the various “Protecting the Disassembled Components” sections.

**Comment 23 (T. Ford): One other general comment: The drawings and sketches and photographs are (should be) a key element in this document. Who is responsible for putting those together?**

Response: I am responsible for the sketches and photographs. We received a bid from Logan Simpson Design to complete the sketches and the photographs will likely come from the Park City Historical Society & Museum, the State Historic Preservation Office, the City’s collection, and current photos on file or taken by me. The final illustrations (photograph or other) will be approved by HPB and staff to make certain that the images used best illustrate the point being made.

**Comment 24 (T. Ford): I also would recommend an appendix with a Model Submittal Package to show applicants what is expected.**

Response: Thank you for the suggestion.

**Comment 25 (S. Werebelow): On page 34 "Sustainability" 3.2 and 3.6 both say that owners are "encouraged" to pursue the various measures - what are the implications for an owner i.e. it is not mandated? I am hoping for an explanation of 3.2 on Monday. I realize this document will be analyzed by an owner's design professional, however, I would imagine we want the guidelines to be understood by owners as well.**

Response: Specific measures that would fall under the category of sustainability are not legally required in the design review process, hence the use of the term “encouraged”. Mandates may be in the works at the city, but I am not aware of them. Regarding 3.2, we are

probably getting ahead of general policy in Park City by including this and it may be necessary to remove the reference to life-cycle assessment or put it into laymen terms. A life-cycle assessment is a systematic process that evaluates the environmental impacts of products, processes, and services. The assessment is only as good as the life-cycle inventory data used in the assessment. The National Renewable Energy Laboratory (affiliated with the U.S. Department of Energy) sets the standard on this issue and has a database on things like plywood, glue laminated beams, steel, etc.... The life-cycle assessment tracks a product's environmental impact from resource extraction through disposal and examines the energy it uses and the pollution it creates. For the preservation world, the emphasis is on the energy already used to produce the building. That energy is the building's embodied-energy and should be taken into consideration when proposing substitute materials, etc...

**Comment 26 (S. Werebelow): Regarding Site Features (page 24 or 37) stated in both commercial and residential sections - 1. through 2.2: retaining, preserving, and maintaining the historic grading, and the original dimensions of a historic retaining wall; I would imagine there should be some caveat here, i.e. when feasible...due to site changes which can necessitate different requirements for retaining walls and grading of a site.**

Response: So noted. We will clarify.

**Comment 27 (S. Werebelow): Lastly, regarding the Residential New Construction section: in the Universal Guidelines #8 - it states that new construction activity should not negatively affect nearby Historically Significant buildings. This could be a contentious issue i.e. how do we define not negatively affect...?**

Response: This should probably read "...should not physically damage nearby Historically Significant buildings". We were hoping for a more literal interpretation of the guideline.

**Comment 28 (S. Werebelow): In the Primary Structures Single Family Mass, Scale & Height:**

**#4 Neighbors view should be considered...this is also very vague – and can tie an owner's hands unreasonably? It is likely in all new construction scenarios that neighbors' views will be impacted - as a new owner will want to max out density?**

Response: This is considered a "good neighbor" provision. It was included as a result of Ken Martz's comments during the last round of reviews.

**Comment 29 (G. Kimball): Page 3- paragraph 2 – You mention "matching grants for projects..." There is a chance this money will not be renewed! I think it comes from the Federal Government and is subject to the whims of Washington. Is there a change the City Council might come up with a property tax break? Perhaps, the City could work with Summit County to extend a tax break County wide?**

Response: I am not familiar with the sources for historic preservation funding in Park City. I will request clarification from staff and hopefully will be able to provide that information at an upcoming meeting.

**Comment 30 (G. Kimball): HPB, Page 4- Last sentence “A roster of current members...etc.” You might have better luck than me in updating the roster.**

Response: I think it has been updated recently. I looked at it today and it appears current. The meeting information, however, reflects a 5:00 p.m. meeting time. I will make a note of it for Patty.

**Comment 31 (G. Kimball): Page 20 – On line four you mention “evidence of missing historic elements...” Is this an error or am I missing something?**

Response: Thanks. It was an error and has been removed.

**Comment 32 (G. Kimball): Stone Retaining Walls. Here on 2.1 It states: “Retain and preserve historic stone retaining walls in their original location.” Which I’m all for. But I know of one instance where permits were granted and everything seem in order. The when excavating into the hillside (behind either the Crescent Condo or Bad Ass Coffee) a wonderful circular stone wall was uncovered. I spied it while driving by, and thought that evening when construction ended I would inspect the wall. Four hours later there was not one stone standing. I realize no one suspected a wall was there and I presume no laws were broken, but... There should be something in the code to cover this type of occurrence. Even if it only stops the destruction until the site can be photograph and it uses interpreted.**

Response: I am not familiar with this case and will ask someone in planning to comment

**Comment 33 (G. Kimball): Sustainability 3.2 “Current life-cycle assessment...” etc. I believe this language is getting to sound a bit like bureaucratic gobbledeygook. Still I can make out it’s meaning and it probably does not need changing.**

Response: See response to Comment 25.

**Comment 34 (K. Martz): I would like to see a reference section relating to the Land Management Code when it is referenced in the Guidelines.**

Response: So noted.

**Comment 35 (K. Martz): Regarding Peer Review I think it should be mandatory rather than voluntary.**

Response: We will be talking about the Design Review Process more this month.

**Comment 36 (K. Martz): Under Additions and in general all rehabilitation I think an ongoing file should be kept on all significant buildings as a lot of them are going through a number of remodel phases and its hard to tell what’s old and new with these buildings.**

Response: The permit files are kept in the planning office, but I do not know for how long before they are archived. I will ask Pat.

**Comment 37 (K. Martz): Regarding Disassembly/Reassembly. I think General principle need to be underlined as planning went through a phase where it was more the norm than the exception. I really like the documentation requirements under this section as well.**

Response: So noted.

**Comment 38 (K. Martz): Under all significant buildings and maybe even with new construction under historical guidelines planning and or the building department needs to have on site inspection as it relates to compliance the agreed upon building process. I have seen a lot of historic fabric disappear over the years.**

Response: We can talk about this in the context of the Design Review Process.

### **Section 3: Timeline & Next Steps:**

#### **February 11, 2008 @ 10:00-11:00 a.m. – Work Session**

Discussion will focus on items 1-5 above.

#### **February 25, 2008 @ 10:00 a.m. – Work Session**

Discussion will focus on proposed LMC changes that have already received an initial review by the Planning Commission:

- 1) Design guideline application to Historically Significant buildings outside the historic districts;
- 2) Establishment of a Volunteer Peer Review Meeting as part of the Design Review Process; and
- 3) Building Height;

#### **February 27, 2008**

Joint Council/Planning Commission/HPB meeting. HPB should participate in an update of the review of proposed design standards and Land Management Code revisions to confirm initial direction on items 1-5 above and overall project progress.