



HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
JANUARY 28, 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 – JANUARY 7, 2008

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: January 26, 2008

Posted: January 25, 2008

WORK SESSION

Historic Preservation Board Staff Report



Author: Patrick Putt
Subject: Historic District Guidelines
Update
Date: January 28, 2008
Type of Item: Legislative

Planning Department

We will meet on Monday to continue our review of the Historic District Design Guidelines draft. Please bring your copies of the draft guidelines with you to the meeting.

MINUTES OF JANUARY 7, 2008

PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION
HISTORIC PRESERVATION BOARD
MINUTES OF JANUARY 7, 2008

BOARD MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE: Ken Martz, Todd Ford, David White, Puggy Holmgren, Mark Huber, Gary Kimball, Sara Werbelow

EX OFFICIO: Patrick Putt, Brooks Robinson, Polly Samuels McLean

ROLL CALL

Chair Martz called the meeting to order at 10:30 a.m. and noted that all Board Members were present.

WORK SESSION – Historic District Guidelines Discussion

Planning Director Patrick Putt requested that the Board members provide comments as early as possible, in order to be as productive as possible in reviewing the first portion of the revisions to the Historic District Guidelines. He had received some comments and suggested that the HPB meet the next Monday, January 14th at 10: a.m. to go over the first set of chapters presented at the last meeting. He noted that January 21st is a holiday and there would be no meeting on that Monday.

Director Putt stated that he and Dina Blaes felt it would be helpful early in the process to have some discussion regarding the distinctions and the subtleties between historic districts and conservation districts, and what they have in Park City. How they structure the document will affect how they apply the guidelines.

Ms. Blaes remarked that this discussion would be relevant once they begin to review the residential and commercial new construction chapters. She pointed out that the chapters given to the HPB to date are only residential. The commercial chapters will take a little more tweaking because they include subsections and subchapters for Swede Alley and for the Main Street National Register Historic District. Ms. Blaes stated that the objective for this meeting was to talk about the historic district in Park City versus other communities and why the residential new construction guidelines are written as they are.

In an effort to stay on a two-week meeting cycle, the Board agreed to meet on January 14th and January 28th. Director Putt stated that on January 28th, they would look at four elements; residential, design review process, new construction, and the history of Park City. Dina Blaes requested that the Board members send in their comments by 3:00 p.m. on January 23rd, so they can be incorporated into the discussion on January 28th. She would email the first set of chapters to the Board members later today. She will include a timeline of when she would like their comments and the opportunities for sending them in written form or electronically.

Director Putt passed out the documents that would be discussed on January 28th.

Ms. Blaes wanted to make sure that everyone was on the same page in terms of how historic districts are generally established and how Park City's historic district differs. She noted that the residential new construction guidelines are written more like

conservation district design guidelines. Ms. Blaes stated that when you establish a historic district, traditionally you look at a collection of historic buildings, pertinent related elements, and established geographic boundaries based on that geographic collection of structures that share a period of significance or architecture. She remarked that many jurisdictions commonly have an underlying base zoning that defines setbacks, bulk, density, etc. In addition, they have an overlay zone that adds an extra level of regulation and the historic aspect. Ms. Blaes noted that Park City does it differently. Park City's base zoning is called the Historic District and this throws off people who are used to working with historic districts in other communities. Ms. Blaes pointed out that under Park City's method, the general zoning categories are geographically defined, with many historic resources scattered throughout. It is not a cohesive geographic area you would normally find in a historic district. Ms. Blaes stated that this creates a little bit of trouble when trying to write design guidelines for a quote, unquote "historic district". She remarked that this is especially true for new construction along Lowell Avenue, since there is not a single historic building left on Lowell Avenue.

Ms. Blaes noted that they could expect to see language in the residential new construction that will not seem as strongly tied to Park City's historic resources as they feel it should. She explained that in looking at new construction, they want to be very sensitive to the community character and the development pattern that occurs within these districts. However, it should not be specifically tied to historic buildings. Ms. Blaes remarked that she tried to add language addressing new construction that is within a proximity or adjacent to an historic building. In those areas you would need greater sensitivity to the historic aspect. In areas such as Lowell, where there is no historic reference to the buildings, they would want to respect the development pattern that has already occurred. This will allow the developer and the architect greater latitude with regard to how they choose to articulate their building architecturally.

Ms. Blaes stated that throughout the design forums, she found the problem that when people who are used to working in a traditional type of historic district use the term "historic district", they expect the meaning they are used to. When Park City uses the term Historic District it has a different meaning. Ms. Blaes believes it is important for the design guidelines to put everyone on the same page with regards to what the Historic District in Park City really is. It is a conservation district that has a large number of non-contiguous historic resources. Ms. Blaes remarked that the rehab guidelines focus on trying to protect and provides stringent language on what can and cannot be done with historic buildings. However, the broader issue for new development. New construction has to take into account the fact that these areas are much larger than a traditional historic district.

Ms. Blaes noted that the first paragraph of the new construction for residential chapter talks about types of lots and where they should apply the design guidelines. Residential new construction is for undeveloped lots within the residential zones or lots that have a current building that will be demolished, which could or could not be historic, or on a lot that currently has a historic structure where the new construction will be a detached second building. Ms. Blaes remarked that the language was included because of some applications that are currently being considered or are already in the system. Instead of adding a large addition on to a very small historic home, it might make more sense to put a second structure on a very large lot with an historic building. She believes this could provide better protection for the historic building.

Chair Martz asked if they would call significant buildings something different if they were in more of an outlying area. Mr. Blaes answered no and explained that historically significant buildings are still historically significant, regardless of their location. She pointed out that the rehab guidelines apply to historically significant buildings. To address the issues of an existing building that is not historically significant, a sidebar was written into the rehab guidelines that say if a structure is not historically significant, they should look to the new construction guidelines for guidance. Therefore, the rehab guidelines will not be diluted with things that should be done to buildings that are not historically significant. Those guidelines should focus on protecting the historic resources.

Director Putt reiterated that the purpose today was to provide an explanation that would help them better understand the draft sections they will be receiving. He noted that there would be ample time for future discussions.

Mr. Blaes stated that the guidelines were broken into universal guidelines and specific guidelines. One of the universal design guidelines for residential new construction is to choose a style and design all four sides of the building in the language and vocabulary of that style. She noted that some of the design community may not appreciate being told they may have to choose a style. Another element that was included states that styles that were never part of Park City's history should be avoided. Ms. Blaes remarked that A-frame style is a discussion for another day.

Regarding A-frames, Board Member Kimball commented on the 50 year clause and noted that eventually A-frames will be protected. Mr. Blaes replied that this was an issue for the City to decide as a policy statement. She noted that currently there is only one A-frame in the inventory that qualifies. Ms. Blaes stated that the inventory that was completed has a period of significance that includes the mining era and the very beginnings of the recreation industry. The significance period was cut off at '62.

Board Member Kimball asked if she planned to keep it cut off at '62. Ms. Blaes explained that it is their decision as a City. The City needs to decide whether they want to freeze that as the period of significance and maintain only the mining era and a little bit of the ski history, or whether they should extend that period as they move down the road.

Ms. Blaes noted that many communities choose a period of significance and never change. Alexandria, Virginia is a perfect example. You would think that every building is historic because even the new buildings are built to look a lot like the old buildings. That community chose that period and that's where it stopped, without taking new construction into consideration. Ms. Blaes stated that her issue with that approach is that you do not get great new architecture. In her opinion, always designing to the old trumps the creativity of the design community. As a city, this is something Park City needs to decide.

Ken Martz remarked that so many things have happened in Park City that it is important to remain flexible. Mr. Blaes stated that in their efforts with the new residential construction language, they were trying to be flexible. The goal is to achieve simple building forms and unadorned buildings without a lot of fancy detail, yet still allow flexibility for current architects and designers to come up with a modern interpretation of those core principles.

Chair Martz commented on the importance of having balanced restrictions for new construction and historic structures. Ms. Blaes encouraged him to read through the new residential design guidelines to make sure the language addresses that balance. The goals for choosing a style was to discourage introducing a style inappropriate for Park City, but also to caution against very modern styles that are out of character for Park City development.

Director Putt suggested the possibility of a joint meeting with the Planning Commission once this document matures and gets close to a recommendation. This would allow direct communication and dialogue rather than have the Staff communicate how the document developed and why.

Board Member Werbelow asked about the time frame for the whole process. Ms. Blaes replied that the deadline they put together has the document completed and adoptable by May. She commented on potential conflicts between the existing zoning ordinance and the design guidelines. They need to make sure those match so one does not counter the other. Director Putt noted that a May completion/adoption works well with the summer building season.

Director Putt reported that Liza will be the new Council liaison to the HPB and she is very interested in taking on that role.

The meeting adjourned at 11:05 p.m.

Approved by _____
Ken Martz, Chair
Historic Preservation Board